

Materials for the study of the Vaiśeṣika system

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van Doctor
aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden,
op gezag van de Rector Magnificus Dr. L. Leertouwer,
hoogleraar in de faculteit der Godgeleerdheid,
volgens besluit van het college van dekanen
te verdedigen op woensdag 11 Oktober 1995
te klokke 14.15 uur

door

Harunaga Isaacson

geboren te Kuma, Japan, in 1965

Promotiecomissie:

Promotores:	Prof. Dr. T. E. Vetter
	Prof. Dr. A. Wezler (Universität Hamburg)
Co-promotor:	Dr. H. T. Bakker (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)
Referent:	Prof. Dr. J. Bronkhorst (Université de Lausanne)
Overige leden:	Prof. Dr. H. W. Bodewitz
	Prof. Dr. K. R. van Kooij

Deze onderzoeken werden gesteund door de Stichting voor Filosofie en Theologie, die wordt gesubsidieerd door de Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO).

PREFACE

The disparate parts of this thesis have this in common: making use of Sanskrit manuscript material which has been largely unknown or ignored until now, they each attempt to contribute to our knowledge of the Vaiśeṣika by improving on earlier editions of commentary literature or, in Part 3, by presenting hitherto unpublished recensions of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS). No systematic study of this school of thought is offered here, however, nor even of a particular topic treated therein.¹ It was precisely in the course of attempting such historical studies that, again and again, I found textual difficulties to present so serious a hindrance that it was clear, should they be left undealt with, that the results would rest on flimsy foundations.

Of course I am well aware that there are other lines of approach which could be taken to attempt to improve our knowledge and understanding of the Vaiśeṣika, and it is by no means my intention to denigrate them. One may mention in particular the continuing search for material outside the Vaiśeṣika tradition proper that casts light on it, be it by quotations or direct or oblique references. This may be of great value both in confirming and in supplementing our primary sources. A reason for not devoting much of the present work to exploring this approach is that it is one to which quite a few scholars have paid and continue to pay due attention,² whereas as far as I know manuscript studies of the kind undertaken here are considerably less popular, despite their undeniable importance.

Among primary sources, the most important one left untouched is the curious work, preserved only in a Chinese translation, of which the author's name is generally supposed to have been Candramati and the title *Daśapadārthaśāstra*.³ To have

- 1 That this is not through lack of interest nor a belief that such studies are useless may be seen from a small contribution dealing with the development of a single theme (Isaacson 1994).
- 2 Most recently, Hattori and Tachikawa have studied the material relevant for Vaiśeṣika that can be found in the works attributed to Bhavya (Bhāvaviveka) preserved in Tibetan translations: both presented papers hereon at the panel on early Vaiśeṣika at the 34th ICANAS, August 1993.
- 3 On this text see in the first place Uj 1962 (first published 1917) and Frauwallner 1955. There is also a re-translation into Sanskrit by K. Shukla (*Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute* 19 (1962–1963), 147–158 and 20 (1963–1965), 111–130), of somewhat dubious value I would

attempted to deal afresh with this work would have been foolhardy in one lacking the necessary linguistic competence; I am happy to leave that to a scholar who is equally at home in Sinology and Indology.

Within its limited scope, the contents of this volume represent a step forward, drawing as it does on important manuscript material that has not been used before. Nonetheless the basic work of collecting manuscripts and of editing the few remaining Vaiśeṣika works is still far from done. To confine ourselves to the works we know of and to some of the most urgent cases: Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha* (PDhS) has been edited frequently, but never critically and never with the use of all the material that might be drawn on for that purpose;⁴ Vyomaśiva's commentary on the PDhS, the *Vyomavatī*, still awaits an editor willing and able to prepare a critical edition based directly on the ancient manuscript in Mysore; Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS still requires much more attention, in both its versions, particularly the portions which have not been taken up for consideration here; the 'Senā Court' commentary on *adhyāya* 10 of the VS has yet to be published; and Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyalīlāvatī* too seems to me to be badly in need of attention from a scholar with learning and critical judgment.⁵ All of these represent large and difficult tasks—it is to be regretted that the people to whom they might be entrusted with confidence are so rare. It should also be stressed that here too, as of course in other fields of ancient Indian studies, there is an urgency of which it is necessary to be conscious: as time advances much of India's precious legacy of manuscripts, the record of millennia of literary and scholarly activity of great brilliance, is being destroyed at a rapid pace. Of classical, Greek and Latin, texts it may be true that our editions are 'good enough to live with,'⁶ but this is not the case with the works of

say. Prof. Dr. K. Miyamoto has recently informed me that he intends to publish a critical edition of the Chinese text and a fresh Sanskrit re-translation.

- 4 There may be some hope that this situation will improve in not too long a time. Several scholars have turned their attention to the problems of this text in recent years; their work is surveyed in Appendix 3 below, where I have also ventured some suggestions on how to deal with the not inconsiderable text-critical problems with which a would-be editor is faced.
- 5 It appears that O. Grohmann had begun to study the *Nyāyalīlāvatī*, with a view to making it the subject of a 'Habilitationsschrift,' shortly before his early death; see G. Oberhammer's brief obituary in WZKS 19 (1975), 182.
- 6 A classical scholar of distinction, D. R. Shackleton Bailey, who in his youth also distinguished himself as a Sanskritist and Tibetanist, wrote some time ago the following words on the situation of Greek and Latin textual criticism.

It is generally recognized that a classical editor's first duty is to furnish the best possible text. Professor Dodds of Oxford, himself a highly accomplished textual critic, once opined that our (classical) texts are good enough to live with. I suppose that de-

ancient India. A large number remain unedited to this day, and most of the editions we do have are intolerably poor—intolerably at least for those whose aim is not the construction of grandiose theories without a really reliable basis. This is not to say that the defects of our editions entail that nothing useful can be done on the basis of studying them, only that anyone who has become aware of the extent of the problem can hardly use them without having most serious doubts as to their reliability and without realizing how sharp is the need for improvement.⁷

Without wasting more words, let me simply ask anyone who still thinks that the printed editions we have can be generally relied on without requiring special caution, to compare the edition given in Part I below with Thakur's edition of the same portion of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary—bearing in mind that even further improvement is certainly possible.

A single technical note may be advisable; in quoting from printed Sanskrit texts I have on some occasions made silent alterations in non-material points, such as

pend in the first place on one's standard of living. Certainly a great deal has been done for nearly all of them (much more for some than for others): a good modern text compared with a sixteenth-century one will show that on every page. But not all modern texts are good. Many are produced by editors badly trained and badly equipped, conservative because the evidence of their manuscripts is the only evidence they think they understand, who not only fail to push back the frontiers of darkness but revel in it as their natural environment. . . . Let us hope that a few competent practitioners and a larger number of instructed readers will continue to keep the new barbarians at bay. (Shackleton Bailey 1976, 26–27)

It need hardly be said that compared with classical studies, the situation for texts in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan is infinitely worse, and that 'competent practitioners' are so few as to sometimes appear in danger of disappearing.

- 7 I may permit myself the indulgence of self-quotation on this point: 'My plea is therefore in the first place that we should not forget how our knowledge ultimately rests on highly perishable documents, the larger part of which has yet to be studied thoroughly. This is something which some who work exclusively with printed texts may occasionally lose sight of. This does not mean that I advocate all of us immediately leaving our desks to go in search of manuscripts, although I do think that such work must be kept up by a few at least. But we should remember not to accord the editions we have more authority than they deserve. Chance has played too great a rôle in determining which texts are now available to us as printed books, and in what form—the chance of one work surviving while another was lost; the chance of one being transmitted more or less faithfully while another was corrupted by poor scribes or changed deliberately to suit the needs or taste of a later period; the chance of one being discovered while another molds in an unsearched stack of manuscripts; the chance of one finding a competent and sensitive editor while another suffers from the rough hands of an impatient scholar, all too quick to emend what he does not understand. With this in our minds, we would do well to be humble about the reconstructions we may arrive at of the thought of writers separated from us by so many centuries and the work of so many scribes.' (Isaacson 1995, 777).

punctuation or orthography. All substantive changes have of course been indicated as such. When quoting from manuscripts, however, the orthography and punctuation of the scribes have been reproduced as closely as possible.

I have been helped by many people in the course of preparing this work, and have tried to acknowledge this at the most appropriate places. My greatest debt is to my teachers; unfortunately I cannot thank them all here as I would like to. I would however like to express my gratitude and indebtedness to two *sabrahmacārins*, Dominic Goodall and Claudius Nenninger. From both I have learnt much, in conversation and while reading Sanskrit texts together, and their good nature and friendship are things I value much and that cannot be valued too highly.

Finally, it should be said that despite the sincerity of my attempts and the patience of my teachers in correcting my mistakes, I am in no doubt that errors remain in my work. I can only hope that it will not be long before others take the next significant step to improve on it and succeed in making the voices of these thinkers heard yet more clearly.

CONTENTS

PART I: Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS	1
1.1 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra	1
1.2 Other works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra	5
1.2.1 <i>Mahāvidyāviḍambana</i>	6
1.2.2 Commentary on the <i>Kiraṇāvalī</i>	6
1.2.3 Other works attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra	8
1.3 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS	10
1.3.1 The editions of the two versions	10
1.3.2 The title of the VS commentary	12
1.3.3 The relation between the two versions	13
1.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought	23
1.4.1 Ontology	25
1.4.2 Epistemology	29
1.4.3 Theology and soteriology	31
1.4.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's relation with other philosophers	36
1.4.5 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style	39
1.5 The new edition and its basis	40
1.5.1 The manuscript of the abridged version	41
1.5.2 Description of the manuscript	43
1.5.3 The script and the scribe	43
1.5.3.1 Scribal errors and corrections	44

1.5.4 Editorial policy	45
1.5.5 The <i>sūtrapāṭha</i> followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra	48
1.5.6 Conventions of the text and apparatus	52
1.5.7 The translation and notes	55
Text	57
Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1	57
Adhyāya 6, āhnika 2	60
Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1	64
Adhyāya 7, āhnika 2	71
Translation	78
Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1	78
Adhyāya 6, āhnika 2	89
Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1	100
Adhyāya 7, āhnika 2	121
PART II: Candrānanda's commentary on the VS	140
2.1 Candrānanda	140
2.2 The <i>editio princeps</i>	143
2.3 The manuscripts of the commentary	145
2.3.1 Description of the manuscripts	145
2.3.2 The relationship between the manuscripts	148
2.4 Editorial policy	151
2.5 Conventions of the text and apparatus	153
2.6 The textual commentary	156

Contents

vii

Text	158
Adhyāya 1, āhnika 1	158
Adhyāya 1, āhnika 2	168
Adhyāya 2, āhnika 1	172
Commentary	180
 PART III: The <i>sūtrapāṭha</i> manuscripts of the VS	200
3.1 Introduction	200
3.2 The Ahmedabad MS	205
3.2.1 Description of the manuscript	205
3.2.2 The script and the scribe	206
3.2.2.1 Scribal errors and corrections	206
3.2.2.2 Ambiguities of the script	208
3.2.3 Diplomatic transcription	209
3.2.4 Reconstruction of the <i>sūtrapāṭha</i>	216
3.2.5 Analysis of variants	230
3.2.6 Evaluation	256
3.3 The Trivandrum MS	258
3.3.1 Description of the manuscript	258
3.3.2 The script and the scribe	259
3.3.2.1 Scribal errors and omissions	259
3.3.2.2 Ambiguities of the script	261
3.3.3 Diplomatic transcription	262
3.3.4 Reconstruction of the <i>sūtrapāṭha</i>	270
3.3.5 Analysis of variants	283
3.3.6 Evaluation	299
3.4 Conclusion	300

APPENDIX 1: Concordance of the recensions of the VS	301
APPENDIX 2: Concordance of manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary	314
APPENDIX 3: On the text-critical problems of the PDhS	315
APPENDIX 4: References in Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's writings	340
BIBLIOGRAPHY	354

PART I

BHAṬṬA VĀDĪNDRA'S COMMENTARY ON THE VS

This part consists of a new edition and an annotated translation of selected chapters from a commentary on the VS which is, as will be shown below, an abridged version of a much lengthier commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. The edition seeks to improve on the text established by Anantalal Thakur in the *editio princeps* of 1957; unlike that edition it is based directly on the manuscript, a *codex unicus*. As far as I know no substantial portion of the commentary has been translated into any language before. This is in part due, no doubt, to the fact that despite Thakur's efforts the text that he gives is often incorrect and indeed incomprehensible.

1.1 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

We are fortunate in knowing with some degree of certainty when the philosopher Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra¹ lived and wrote. There is, briefly, evidence for his date chiefly from two quarters: the references he himself makes to his royal patrons, and a verse in which his direct pupil Bhaṭṭa Rāghava gives the year in which he, in his turn, wrote his *Nyāyasāravacāra*. Both of these types of evidence were already taken into account by M. R. Telang, the editor of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* (MVV), who was the first scholar to deal with our author and his date, and whose discussion is characterized by good sense. However, although Telang arrived at quite acceptable conclusions, some recent publications make statements with re-

1 Our author also uses and is referred to by other names and epithets, notably Mahādeva, Hara-kiṃkara and Śaṃkarakiṃkara; possibly also Vādīśa (cf. p. 8 below). Whether Mahādeva should indeed to be regarded as his 'real name,' as Telang concludes after a brief discussion (1920, xi-xii), is not quite certain. I think (should that rather be regarded as an abbreviation of Mahādevakiṃkara?); be that as it may, I have chosen to refer to him throughout in the way he himself uses most frequently, which is also the one in which many (though not all) other authors make reference to him. Self-references may be located with the help of Appendix 4; for references to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in other writers' works see Telang 1920, 35-38.

gard to these matters which, far from bringing our knowledge any further, seem to represent a step backwards, and it may not be out of place to once more set down what we know and what may safely be conjectured.

In the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana*, the third verse of the third *pariccheda* runs as follows.

teṣāṃ² eṣa viśeṣeṇa nirākaraṇasambhramaḥ |
śrīsimhadharmādhyakṣeṇa³ vādīndreṇa vidhīyate || (MVV 99.20–
 21)

Telang (1920, xii) proposed identifying the Śrīsimha of this verse with the Yādava king Śiṅghana (or Simhaṇa), and pointed out that other authors patronized by this king (or his successor), notably Hemādri, the author/compiler of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, and Jalhaṇa or Jahlaṇa, the compiler of the *Sūktimuktāvalī*, call him Simha or Śrīsimha. There is abundant material available on this king and his reign, both from inscriptions and from (semi-)historical works of literature. He most probably assumed the throne in A.D. 1210 and died towards the end of A.D. 1246; his successor Kṛṣṇa was crowned in November or December A.D. 1246.⁴

The other key piece of evidence to which Telang drew attention is the concluding verse of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's commentary on the *Nyāyasāra*, the *Nyāyasāravīcāra*.⁵ This author refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as his guru in several places, as well as quoting verses from him which have not been preserved elsewhere. Unfortunately, the chronogram verse is not completely unambiguous, and it is possible to interpret the intended year as Śaka 1174 (A.D. 1252) or as Śaka 1274 (A.D. 1352).⁶ Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's own reference to his patron, however, led Telang to decide in favour of the former possibility. No other king Simha, or one similarly named, is known whose period of rule agrees closely enough with the alternative possibility.

Another argument against the later dating for Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's work was given by Gopinath Kaviraj, who mentions the fact that a manuscript of the *Nyāyasāravīcāra* in the Government Sanskrit Library, Benares, contains a statement of purchase written by a later hand and dated *saṃvat* 1428. To quote Kaviraj:

- 2 The demonstrative pronoun refers to the proponents of the Mahāvīdyā syllogisms, mentioned in the preceding verse as *śivādityādiārkaḥ*.
- 3 Bhuvanandarasūri's commentary paraphrases *śrīsimhanareśvarasya dharmādhyakṣiṇā* (99.21–22).
- 4 A convenient and reliable source of information on the reign of this king and further references is Altekar 1982, 531–543.
- 5 Telang and Gopinath Kaviraj (1961 [first published 1924]) both quoted this work from manuscripts. It was finally published for the first time in 1976, edited by Umā Ramaṇa Jha.
- 6 For discussion see Telang 1920, xii and Kaviraj 1961, 31 n. 67.

This statement shows that the Ms. was purchased in A.D. 1371. Consequently the date of transcription must be earlier, and that of composition much earlier still. In view of this circumstance the alternative of A.D. 1352 as the date of the composition of the work does not strike me as probable. I therefore accept the former interpretation of the verse and take the date to represent A.D. 1252. (Kaviraj 1961 [first published 1924] 31 n.67).⁷

Another important piece of information is learned from the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, which was not available to Telang. According to a colophon which follows the extended commentary on the first three sūtras—here called *trisūtrīvyākhyā*—the work was written by the Yādava king (Śrī)kr̥ṣṇa.⁸ The other colophons, it should be noted, as well as the opening verse of the work, refer to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra alone as the author, and contain no reference to this king. No matter how this discrepancy is to be explained,⁹ the attribution is likely to be little more than a courtly fiction;¹⁰ but the explicit mention of the *yadukula* confirms Telang's assumption, and it therefore is safe to conclude that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra survived his first patron and continued his philosophical writings at the court of king Kr̥ṣṇa, the grandson of Siṃhaṇa, who is known to have reigned from A.D. 1246–1260.

Further corroboration can be found in the fact, also adduced by Telang, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and his *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* are referred to by the Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedāntin Veṅkaṭanātha, who is thought to have flourished between A.D. 1267 and A.D. 1369. Though this is not sufficient to settle anything, it is more consistent with a date in the thirteenth than in the fourteenth century, especially since Veṅkaṭanātha does not refer to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as a contemporary, but together with Udayana

7 Despite these earlier discussions, the editor of the *Nyāyasāra* vicāra, Jha, to one's surprise simply states that the work was composed in A.D. 1352, quoting the disputed verse as proof with no mention of the fact that it is open to a different interpretation, and one which seems to accord better with other known facts (introduction, p. 18).

8 *iti śrīyadukulakamalakalikāvīkāsabhāskarabhūpālalalitamahārājādhirājaśrīkr̥ṣṇabhūpālavi-racite iarkasāgaranāmnī vaiśeṣikasūtravārtike trisūtrīvyākhyā samāptā* (Thakur 1960, 23 n.2; *Tarkasāgara* 57.18–22); cf. also p. 12 below.

9 One possibility would be that it is only the *trisūtrīvyākhyā* which is intended to be attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's patron, despite the fact that the compound **viracite* qualifies *vaiśeṣika-sūtravārtike* and not *trisūtrīvyākhyā*. This interpretation was presupposed in Isaacson 1995, 766–767 footnote 44, with no mention of the fact that it is not supported by the actual wording of the colophon and is far from certain.

10 In this I agree with Thakur, who writes: 'The attribution only shows Vādīndra's devotion to Śrī-kr̥ṣṇabhūpāla who seems to be his patron in later life. The work was written by Vādīndra himself and the initial verse is clear on this point' (1960, 23). It may be added that both the content and the style of the *trisūtrīvyākhyā* stamp this section too as the work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

(Telang 1920, xiv).

To summarize the facts of which we may be certain, we know that the *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana*, which was probably Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's earliest work (cf. p. 6 below), was written during the reign of Siṃhaṇa, i.e. sometime between A.D. 1210 and A.D. 1246, and that the commentary on the VS, which there is reason to think may be his last work (cf. p. 13 below), was written when Kṛṣṇa was king, i.e. sometime between A.D. 1246 and A.D. 1260. Furthermore, we know that a direct disciple of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra composed a work in A.D. 1252. As far as I can see, it is not possible to pinpoint matters any closer than this. One might speculate that, since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was alive in A.D. 1246, he probably also was still alive in A.D. 1252, because there is nothing in Bhaṭṭa Rāghava's references to his guru to suggest that he had died not long before. But this is obviously a flimsy argument, based on presuppositions which can not be verified. In any case, if pressed for dates, it would be reasonable to say that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was probably active between about A.D. 1230 and A.D. 1250, the former of these dates being the less firm of the two. As to the place where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra worked, his apparently close connection with two successive ruling monarchs makes their capital city Devagiri (modern Daulatabad) in northern Mahārāṣṭra the most likely candidate.

Beyond this, there is little information that can be gleaned about Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's life. The concluding verse of the *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana* gives the name of a guru from whom Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra acquired *śabdavidyā* as Yogīśvara; there are no other references to this or other teachers in his work.¹¹ This Yogīśvara is not known, as far as I am aware, from any other source. The description of our author by his commentator Bhuvanasundarasūri (writing perhaps two hundred years or so after Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) as *tarkasāhityālaṅkāraśāstrasārthāmbhodhipārīṇa-pratibhaḥ svakṛtyādūṣyavaiduṣyakalārañjitanānārendrasabhaḥ* (MVV 1.21–22) is not one on which too much reliance can be placed, I would have thought, though Thakur seems to accept this without questioning as 'showing that he was proficient in various śāstras including Logic, Literature and Poetics and he 'decorated' many royal courts by his presence' (Thakur 1960, 22). Bhuvanasundarasūri may well be simply elaborating with some imagination on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's reference to his position as *dharmādhyakṣa* at Siṃhaṇa's court. We have no internal evidence that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was as versed in *sāhitya* and *alāṅkāraśāstra* as he was in *tarka*; there is certainly little in his prose style that suggests it.¹²

In view of the consistent body of evidence as to the period in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra lived, it is rather surprising to see that some modern scholars have

11 The verse runs *yogīśvaraguroḥ śabdavidyām āśādya tattvataḥ | vyadhata bhaṭṭavādīndro mahāvidyāvidāmbanam||* (MVV 149.21–22).

12 For a few comments on the style of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings see p. 39f. below.

given significantly different dates for him, usually without adducing any arguments. Thus B. K. Matilal, in a booklet intended as a guide to the literature of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, in one place dates our author 'ca. fourteenth century A.D.' (1977, 59) and in another says that he 'might have been a senior contemporary of Maṇikaṇṭha,' whom he puts at A.D. 1300 (1977, 103), in neither case giving reason or reference. In yet another place he speaks of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS as 'belonging to the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D.' (1977, 75), and mentions that 'Thakur conjectures that it may be from the pen of Vādīndra,' without, however, commenting on the discrepancy between such a conjecture, his own dating of the text and his dating of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

Another recent reference work on Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, the second volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies*, is less inconsistent and a little nearer the mark, but the dates given there, apparently on the authority of D. C. Bhattacharya,¹³ of (A.D.) 1175–1225 (Potter 1977, 11) must be too early by at least a quarter of a century. As for the observation that, on the grounds of his being Siṃhaṇa's 'dharmādhyakṣin' (sic, for *dharmādhyakṣa*) and being patronized by Kṛṣṇa, he flourished 'during the first quarter of the 13th century' (Potter 1977, 646), this seems to go flagrantly against the plentiful epigraphic and other evidence for the dates of reign of both these kings.¹⁴

1.2 Other works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

Before turning to the commentary on the VS which is our main concern here, something should be said about the other works by our author of which we have knowledge.

- 13 No precise reference is given, and the only work of D. C. Bhattacharya available to me in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's date is mentioned speaks of him as having flourished 'in the reign of the famous Yādava king Siṃhana (1210–47 A.D.)' (1958, 64), which does not accord well with the dates given on his authority by Potter.
- 14 A minor quibble on the relative dating proposed in Potter 1977: Vādivāgīśvara is placed after Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (p. 11), but, as was pointed out already by Thakur (1960, 29) the latter refers to Vādivāgīśvara (see *Tarkasāgara* 184.25 and 221.26), who therefore probably predates him or is a senior contemporary.

1.2.1 *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana*

This work explaining and refuting the Mahāvidyā syllogism¹⁵ was the first of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings to be published. It seems also to have been the most famous and was very probably the first to be written; at least, as we shall see below, there are some indications which suggest that the other surviving works were composed later. In any case, it is the only one which has been preserved complete and on which commentaries are extant. Telang was able to make use of three manuscripts of the text itself, three of a commentary on it by Bhuvana-sundarasūri,¹⁶ and one incomplete manuscript of another commentary by one Ānandapūrṇa.¹⁷

1.2.2 *Commentary on the Kiraṇāvalī*

Two years after Telang's edition of the *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana* was published, another work by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra appeared under the title *Rasasāra*. This is a commentary, of which but a single manuscript is known to survive, on the *guṇa* section of Udayana's *Kiraṇāvalī* (itself of course a commentary on Praśastapāda's PDhS). The editor, Gopinath Kaviraj, remarked that the title is a somewhat strange one, and pointed out that this name (as well as the name of the commentator) is not referred to in the body of the text, but is given 'on the covering leaf only' (introduction, p. 2).¹⁸ It is my opinion that this name is indeed wrong; possibly the covering leaf in fact originally belonged to another manuscript. That *Rasasāra* was not the name given by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra to his commentary on Udayana's work is demonstrated by a reference to it by the author himself; in the long version of the VS commentary we read at one place '[*prapañcitan*]'¹⁹ *caitad asmiābhir haraprasādanāmni kira-ṇāvalīdarpaṇake* (135.14; cf. Thakur 1960, 24).

15 On this topic see especially the introduction by Telang to his edition of the *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana* and the summary of the text by E. R. Sreekrishna Sharma in Potter 1977, 647–652.

16 Telang gives A.D. 1399–1460 as approximate dates for this Śvetāmbara Jain author (p. xxix).

17 Telang identifies this Ānandapūrṇa with the author of a commentary on Śrīhaṛṣa's *Khaṇḍana-khaṇḍakhādyā* and places him between A.D. 1529 and A.D. 1600 (p. xxv–xxvii).

18 It should be noted that, as Kaviraj points out, although when seen by him the manuscript contained no indication of the author of the work, Hall, in his *Contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the Indian Philosophical Systems* had referred to the same manuscript and identified the author as 'Mahādeva Vādīndra, pupil of one Śaṅkara' (Hall 1859, 67). Kavirāja concluded, not unreasonably, that 'the Ms. in Hall's time contained one leaf or rather half-leaf more at the end—the last, I believe, bearing either in the colophon or elsewhere the name and other particulars of the author' (introduction p. 2).

19 The brackets presumably indicate here that the word has been supplied by the editor to fill a lacuna.

Several decades intervened before, in 1956, another text by our author was published. This time it was his commentary on the *dravya* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, which appeared in the *Bibliotheca Indica* series, edited, again from a unique manuscript (in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta), by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha and published with no other title than *Kiraṇāvalīṭīkā*.²⁰ It is likely that the two parts of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary in fact belong together as a single work. This is suggested by the fact that at the one place where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself refers to the work (see above), no specification is added as to which part of the *Kiraṇāvalī* it commented on. Furthermore, the commentary on the *guṇa* section opens with a single verse of obeisance to Śiva, which is identical to the *maṅgala* verse of the third *pariccheda* of the *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana*. This suggests that this was merely the beginning of a new section, not of an entirely different work, especially because in the two cases where the beginning of a work by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is preserved, the *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* and the (long) commentary on the VS, we find more than one introductory verse and a mention of the author's name. Though the author himself refers to the work as the *Haraprasādanāma Kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇaka*, as we just saw, in view of the fact that it has been published in two different parts and by different editors, I refer to these parts in the following for convenience sake as *Dravyakiraṇāvalīṭīkā* (DKṬ) and *Guṇakiraṇāvalīṭīkā* (GKṬ) respectively.

As to the relative dating of this work, it is clear that it must be earlier than the VS commentary, since the latter refers to it. In relation to the *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* it is likely to be later, for though that work is not directly mentioned, a verse at the end of the section on *īśvarasiddhi* refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's mastery of the *mahāvīdyā* syllogism.²¹ Admittedly this can hardly be called strong evidence, but it seems a plausible assumption that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first distinguished himself with the highly specialized brief treatise and later demonstrated his command of a broader field by the writing of the *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary.

An additional piece of circumstantial evidence might be found in the fact that it is only in the *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions and acknowledges his debt to a teacher:²² this could be thought to be consistent with the assump-

20 There may be said to be a slight bibliographical confusion about this publication, in that Potter's *Bibliography* (for all its shortcomings a very helpful as well as a unique work) gives the title of the commentary as *Rasasāra* (1983, 213, item 3997), in other words, identical with that under which the commentary on the *guṇa* section appeared. This error is presumably responsible for another, more serious one: in the account of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and his works given in the volume of the *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies* dealing with pre-Gangeśa Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika (Potter 1977), only the commentary on the *guṇa* section is mentioned and (rather inadequately) summarized.

21 *pravṛtante jagannātha sanāthā nirupadravāḥ mahāvīdyādivinyāśā mayi śaṅkarakimkāre* [DKṬ 677.22-23].

22 Cf. p. 4 above.

tion that it is his earliest work. This argument, which is in any event one of dubious value, is nullified, however, by the fact that the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* is the only one of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works to have been preserved in its entirety, as it cannot be ruled out that if we had the two commentaries in the form in which they were written we would find similar references to his teacher(s).

As the oldest commentary known to have been preserved on the *Kiraṇāvalī*, this work is obviously of considerable interest and importance. Particularly noteworthy is that on several occasions Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra refers to and discusses variant readings of Udayana's work;²³ at other places, though he does not mention variants, it can be determined that the reading commented on differs from that in the printed editions we have.²⁴ It is therefore somewhat disappointing that in the only translation and study of a substantial section from the *Kiraṇāvalī* published so far (Tachikawa 1981), Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is neither drawn on nor even mentioned.

1.2.3 Other works attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

On one ground or another the following works have been attributed to our author.

A commentary on the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* As was first pointed out by Kaviraj in the introduction to his edition of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* (p. 6; repeated at Kaviraj 1961, 30). Śeṣa Śārṅgadharma (fl. ca. A.D. 1450), in his commentary *Nyāyamuktāvalī* on Udayana's *Lakṣaṇāvalī*, refers to an alternative explanation, which he attributes to a Vādīśa.²⁵ The same author also mentions 'Vādīndra',²⁶ and Kaviraj believes that our author is meant in both cases, and on this ground attributes a commentary on the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* to him. Potter mentions this attribution and, with a question-mark, lists such a work under the writings of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (Potter 1977).

- 23 Three instances of this are cited by Thakur (1960, 25 n.3): the third, for which he fails to give a reference, is to be found at GKṭ 35.2-8. Yet another reference to *prathamapustakalekhaśadoṣa* may be found at DKṭ 630.7. Another case that may be mentioned is at DKṭ 619.4, where after commenting on the compound *pravīṭabahuvelapraṁkriyājāladuḥstham* in the fourth introductory verse of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra remarks *kvacit tu pravīṭabahuvelam iti pāṭhaḥ*. Incidentally, Jetly's edition of the *Kiraṇāvalī* reads the line in question *pravīṭabahuvelam; prakriyājāladuḥkham*; his apparatus reports a variant 'vela' for 'velam' in an earlier edition.
- 24 The editors of DKṭ and GKṭ have drawn attention in footnotes to some, though not all, of these instances.
- 25 The reference is found at 29.19-23; the passage reads *vādīśas tu sādhanasābdasya kārana-vācīnam abhyupagāmya nirvikalpakaśarīrasaṁyogādihikaraṇatve sati yogajadharmajanyajanyasāksūtkāraviśayaive sati śarītvādhikaraṇam indriyam iti yathāśrutam evaitad vyācakṣate*. From the style this could certainly be a definition proposed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra; unfortunately we have no definition of *indriya* in the three surviving works to compare it with.
- 26 At 23.6 and 42.6; cf. Telang 1920, 38.

11: cf. also 647). I see no way of establishing any more certainty in this matter. Certainly Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was well acquainted with Udayana's works, as is shown by his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* and his references to the (Nyāya) *kusumāñjali* (DKT 663.14, GKṬ 92.24), however it would be a little surprising if he indeed selected this relatively minor work of Udayana's to comment on.

Kāṇādarahasya? Matilal writes in his fascicule on Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika in the *History of Indian Literature* that 'Vādīndra (ca. fourteenth century A.D.) says in his Kāṇāda-rahasya that an old Vaiśeṣika-sūtra text was originally composed by Lord Śiva and the present sūtra text was written by Kaṇāda when Lord Śiva, taking the form of an owl, instructed Kaṇāda' (1977, 59). No reference or authority is given for this statement, which I am inclined to regard as a slip of the pen. No other source known to me attributes a *Kāṇādarahasya* to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, and the other references to a work of this title in Matilal's book are all to a composition of Śaṅkara Miśra. Matilal must have meant to write *Kāṇādasūtranibandha*, and the statement is no doubt based on the brief description of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS given by Thakur, where he writes that 'Vādīndra informs us that one *Prācīna-vaiśeṣikamahāsūtra* composed by Lord 'Śiva' [sic] himself is presupposed by the present *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* which also was taught to Kaṇāda by the Lord in the form of an owl' (1960, 28).²⁷

²⁷ The passages from the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on which this remark was based are now at last available in the Sanskrit, and run as follows. *na ca paramēśvara-prasādaśrāddharmādīśātkāravān paramēśvaranīyuktaś ca bhagavān kaṇādo munir ity atra mānūbhāvaḥ sāmpradāyikācārapramāṇavāt | upadīśanti hi [sāmpradāyikāḥ] kaṇādo munir uttāraśrāddharmāḥ paramēśvarād dharmādīśātkārād dharmopadeśanīyogam āśādyā vaiśeṣikasūtram aśūtrayad iti* (2.7-10). *kimarīham | īarīhi dharmavyākhyānam | parārīham ity avai-
hī | parair avagaṇo dharmo 'nuṣṭhīyate ca pareṣāṃ svargāpavargasiādheḥ | paragatau svargā-
pavargau na phalam iti cet—na. pareṣāṃ eva phalanvāt | paragaṇo 'parasya na phalam iti
cet—na. nityamuktasya bhagavataḥ paramēśvarasya dharmād dharmasāddharopadeśavedapra-
pētuḥ paragatasvargāpavargaprayojanavēna dṛṣṭāntavirahāt | vaiśeṣikasūtraprapētuḥ para-
gatau svargāpavargau na prayojanam iti cet—na. īśvarasyāpi prācīnavaiśeṣikamahāsūtrapra-
pētrvābhyupagamāt | etadvaiśeṣikasūtraprapētuḥ paragatau svargāpavargau na prayojanam
iti cet—na. īśvarasyāpy etasīsūtraprapētrvābhyupagamāt |* (8.21-24). With regard to the sec-
ond passage, however, it should be noted that it has been partially misrepresented by Thakur, for
the twice repeated *īśvarasyāpi* apparently intends to emphasize that Śiva also, i.e., presumably,
together with Kaṇāda, is a *prapētr* of the VS: this is confirmed by the fact that the text continues
antīśvaropadeśānām dvikarīkṛtānād, dṛṣṭāntābhāvāc ca (8.24; presumably *antīśvaropadeśānām*
must be taken as meaning authoritative teachings which were not given by God himself directly
and alone, as the Vedas were). As for the reference to a *prācīnavaiśeṣikamahāsūtra*, it is most
likely another example of the old and well attested Indian idea that the knowledge and revealed
texts now available to us are but a fraction of an original more extensive revelation.

A metrical philosophical treatise Kaviraj, in his introduction to the edition of the commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī*, suggested that 'the quotations under Vādīndra's name as given in the *Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha* and *Nyāyasāravichāra* being in verse, it seems likely that he was the author of a metrical tract' (introduction, p. 6; repeated at Kaviraj 1961, 30). Little can be said on this matter; it is possible that our author indeed wrote such a work, but it is also possible that the verses in question were embedded in a prose work—there are occasional verses in the surviving portions long version of the VS commentary.

1.3 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS

1.3.1 The editions of the two versions

In the introduction to his excellent edition of the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* Telang already mentioned Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, referring to the recent acquisition of (manuscripts of) a *Kaṇādasūtranibandha* by the Madras Government Oriental Library (1920, xvi). Telang himself had no access to these manuscripts, and it was some decades before more became known about this commentary. In 1957 a slim volume appeared containing the text of the VS together with what the title-page called an anonymous commentary.²⁸ It was edited, by Anantalal Thakur, on the basis of a Devanāgarī transcript of a palm-leaf manuscript in Malayalam script (see the discussion on p. 41ff. below). In the introduction, Thakur writes that the commentary 'agrees with the sūtra tradition followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra of the South. A preliminary study of the available portions of the *Kaṇādasūtranibandha* of Vādīndra has convinced us that the present commentary is an abridged version of this 'nibandha'.²⁹ Some time later, after a more thorough comparison of the text he had edited with transcripts of the Madras manuscripts of the commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra on the VS, Thakur concluded that the former was indeed 'nothing but an abridged version of the *Nibandha* giving mainly the interpretation of the sūtras. It

Finally, aside from these passages found only in the long version of the VS commentary one may also note Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's explanation of *uktam* in 2.1.13 (numbered 2.1.12 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version): *uktam iti bhagavatolūkaveśadhārīṇā mahādevaney arthaḥ* (TS 218.11 ≈ V 20.23).

²⁸ Some of the material in the following part of the introduction is taken over, with additions and changes, from Isaacson 1995, section v.

²⁹ English introduction p. 8. The corresponding passage in the Sanskrit *bhūmiḥ* reads *trayodaśa-śatakasthitasya śankarakinkarāparanāmno bhaṭṭavādīndrasya kaṇādasūtranibandhena prasiutasya granthasya dr̥ḥḥaḥ sambandho vihaṅgamadr̥ḥḥaḥ avalokito 'smābhīḥ' i tyam hi vyākhyāḥ viśayasāmnyena bhāṣāsāmnyena ca tasya nibandhasyaiva sūrasamgraharūpā ity ābhāḥ* (p. 26).

must have been prepared by Vādindra himself or some of his followers for those who were interested in the purport of the sūtras and had no aptitude to enter into the abundant discussions of the *Nibandha*.³⁰

The publication of the extant portion of the full commentary, edited again by Thakur, unfortunately only followed very much later, in 1985. This edition is in many respects less satisfactory than the edition of the abridgement: we are, for instance, given no information on the manuscript basis of the text.³¹ Since variant readings are never given, one suspects that the text may be no more than a transcript, sporadically corrected, of a single manuscript.³² This publication also contained a reprint of the text of the abridged commentary in an appendix. This has however practically no value; it introduces new misprints, contains no improvements (though a number would have been possible on the basis of the longer version: cf. below), and does not even incorporate the corrections contained in the list of addenda and corrigenda appended to the original edition. Finally, a second appendix contained another welcome *editio princeps*, this time of the ninth *adhyāya*

³⁰ Thakur 1960, 27. Thakur reaffirmed his opinion that the brief 'anonymous' commentary was an abridgement of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's voluminous one in the introduction he contributed to Muni Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary (p. 17).

³¹ There is no introduction by the editor, though we find an *āmukham* by Dr. Jayamanta Miśra and an *aumakramikam* [sic] by Ānanda Jhā. Neither of these provides the sort of information that a student of the text looks for first.

³² In his article on this text Thakur had mentioned that three manuscripts in Malayalam script are preserved in the Madras Government Oriental Manuscripts Library (1960, 25). When I visited this library in 1991, I was able to see the three original palm-leaf manuscripts, and to determine that they are in an extremely precarious state. There are virtually no folios that are completely intact: indeed for the greater part they are no more than bundles of fragments of various size. In view of their condition I was not able to photograph them all completely, and the photographs that I did take are not all completely legible. The scholar who wishes to take up the task of preparing an improved and more critical edition of the surviving portions of this text will probably have to work in Madras directly with the manuscript fragments. In the following it is only on some rare occasions, when I have been able to locate a passage from the edition in my incomplete photographic record, that I refer to the manuscripts themselves in quoting from the long version of the commentary.

The quotations in Thakur's 1960 article are all based on transcripts of these manuscripts in the Mithila Institute. I doubt that Thakur ever consulted the Malayalam manuscripts themselves. From his description of the extent of the manuscripts, it appears that for a large portion of the preserved text at least two manuscripts should be available. The complete lack of variant readings in the edition is therefore odd. Perhaps the edition is no more than a transcript of the largest of the Mithila Institute transcripts, and has not been collated against the other two transcripts. Alternatively Thakur's account of the transcripts may be wrong: in my very incomplete photographic record of the palm-leaf manuscripts there seems to be no overlapping, so that it is possible that the three manuscript bundles were originally part of a single codex (though there appear to be different scribal hands at work).

of the anonymous commentary on the VS written at the Sena court—yet another text on which Thakur had given valuable information in an earlier article.³³

1.3.2 The title of the VS commentary

It is something of a problem to determine what we should call Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's (long) commentary. The name *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* is found in three of the four colophons quoted from the manuscripts by Thakur (1960, 23 and 26);³⁴ the fourth uses the name *Kaṇādasūtravārttika*.³⁵ These colophons are again reproduced in the printed text. The colophon of the section commenting on the first three sūtras, quoted in full in footnote 8 on p. 3 above, qualifies *vaiśeṣikasūtravārttike* with *tarkasāgaranāmnī*. This provides us with another candidate title, and one which is explicitly said to be a real name rather than a description or generic name (as *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* can be taken to be). Of course the extent to which colophons should be relied on in these matters is debated. Nonetheless, this particular colophon is probably authorial rather than scribal, bearing in mind the fact that it is not a concluding colophon of the work or an *adhyāya* or *āhnika*, but is a complimentary one, perhaps separating what is supposed to be the work of the royal patron (cf. footnote 9 on p. 3 above) from that of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself. Certainly the style of this colophon is more flowery than one would expect a scribal one to be, and it seems more likely that such a colophon should have been composed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra than by a later scribe unconnected with the court of Śrīkrṣṇa. For these reasons, it is plausible that the title *Tarkasāgara* may be the one bestowed on the work by its author, and that he also calls the work a *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika*. It is therefore as the *Tarkasāgara* that I shall refer to the full commentary.³⁶

The titlepage of the *Tarkasāgara* edition refers to the text as *Vaiśeṣikavārttika*, and this form of the title is also used by Halbfass (e.g. Halbfass 1992, 79). As far as I can see, there is no basis for this title in the colophons or the work itself. Most likely it is an abbreviation of *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika* introduced by Thakur or—perhaps even more probably—by the publishers. In his introductions to the

33 Thakur 1965. This article contains some of the basic information on the manuscript material which one would have looked for in an introduction to the edition. The commentary on the tenth *adhyāya*, surviving, like that on the ninth, in a single manuscript in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta, remains unpublished.

34 In Thakur's edition of the long version, these colophons are to be found on pp. 57, 119 and 190.

35 On p. 158 of Thakur's edition.

36 As Thakur remarks (1960, 26), this title seems a fitting one for the work: the surviving portion alone is large enough and full of *tarka* to justify it. As to whether the reader is more likely to find jewels or sea-monsters in it, this depends perhaps largely on how well equipped he is to deal with it.

edition of the abridged version. Thakur had called the text *Kaṇādasūtranibandha*, as we saw above; he also used this form in the introduction he contributed to Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS together with Candrānanda's commentary. Thakur's 1960 article refers to the work as *Kāṇādasūtranibandha*, on the basis of the second half of the opening verse of the commentary: *kāṇādasūtrasya mayā nibandho vidhīyate śaṅkarakinkareṇa*. Finally, the reprint of the abridgement as an appendix to Thakur's edition of the long commentary is given the name *Nibandhasāra*, an allusion to the last two possible titles. But here, again, there is no manuscript authority for such an appellation, and this is probably to be regarded as a title made up by the editor or the publisher.

As we saw above (p. 6) this text refers to the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*. It also explicitly mentions the *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana*³⁷ and is thus beyond doubt Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's latest preserved work.

1.3.3 The relation between the two versions

Whatever its shortcomings, Thakur's publication of the surviving portions of the long version allowed scholars with no direct access to the manuscript material to compare the two commentaries for themselves, at least for a sizeable portion of the text. And in my opinion, Thakur's judgement of the relationship between the two texts is most probably correct. The difference in length between the two commentaries is very great indeed. The available portion of the longer work covers 256 pages in Thakur's edition; the corresponding text of the abridgement, as reprinted in the appendix of the same edition, merely 26. But almost each sentence of the short version can be found also in the long one, though sometimes with slightly different wording. And in numerous places the published text of the long version allows us to correct what are clearly errors in the edition of the abridgement.

This is, I believe, the general picture, but it must be admitted that there are some places where the relationship is less clear, and it is doubtless desirable that the two versions should be compared in a more detailed fashion than was done before. For a single passage, Thakur has given us the two versions printed side by side to facilitate comparison, in a footnote which, though lengthy, leaves the texts to speak for themselves without commentary. Though I cannot here deal with the question as thoroughly as it deserves, I shall adduce a few other passages to illustrate both the close relationship between the texts and the type of differences which do occur.

Sentences which are identical in both versions are easy enough to find; for our pur-

³⁷ *pranāṣṭāṅgaṇaṁ caṇṭha mahāvidyāvidāmbana* (*Tarkasāgara* 101.16).

poses it is more interesting and significant to look at differences and apparent differences. This may not only reveal the extent to which the two versions are related but also may be expected to cast light on the nature of that relation. To start with apparent differences: there are numerous places where a divergence in the texts of the two versions as printed can be shown to be a result of scribal or editorial error. Some examples:

1. *dvau prthag ityādivyavahārasya divi- dviprthag ityādivyavahārasya divi-
tvāvacchinnaprthaktvād evopapatter tvādyavacchinnaprthaktvād evopa-
iti kecit TS 67.5–6 patter iti kecit V 3.22–23*

Since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is here speaking of *vyavahāra*, the reading *dvau prthag* of the long version is to be preferred. And in fact this is exactly what the palm-leaf manuscript of the abridged commentary reads, so that the reading *dviprthag* in this case probably originated as an error in Thakur's transcript. In the case of the other divergence, I suspect that the long version ought to read *dvitvādyavachinna*°, in agreement with V, without however being able to support this by manuscript evidence.

2. A case where both versions appear to be corrupt, and the correct reading has to be reconstructed from the two together is found at the beginning of the commentary on 1.1.22 (1.1.23 in Thakur's edition of V), a sūtra reading *dravyāṇaṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyam*.

<i>na sāmānyam ekam avaśiṣṭam iti yāvat tathānyam yad dravyaṃ yair dravyair janyate tat teṣāṃ ekam kāryam, yathā dvyānukaṃ paramāṇudvayadikkāleśvarāṇām TS 124.23–25</i>	<i>sāmānyaviśiṣṭam ekam iti yāvat tathā hi yad dravyaṃ yair dra- vyair janyate tat teṣāṃ ekam kā- ryam, yathā dvyānukaṃ paramā- ṇudvayadikkāleśvarāṇām V 10.10– 11</i>
--	--

Neither reading of the first words here yields adequate sense, in my opinion; what seems most plausible and consistent with the continuation is *sāmānyam ekam aviśiṣṭam*. The error in V may have had its origin in a transposition of the last two words. In the next sentence the *anyaṃ* of the long version is out of construction; the best seems to read *tathā hi* with V.

3. *dvitīyādikam utkṣepaṇaṃ tu pratha- dvitīyādikam utkṣepaṇaṃ tu pra-
moṭkṣepaṇajanyatvenāpi janyate TS thamoṭkṣepaṇajanyavegenāpi
157.30–31 janyate V 13.11*

The reading printed in the long version must obviously be emended to agree with that found in the short version, as is confirmed by the fact that the long version continues with the remark (omitted in the abridgement) *iti gurutva-prayatnasanyogavegānām sāmānyam kāryam iti* (TS 157.31).

4. Commenting on 1.2.3. *sāmānyam viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam*, we find:

*sāmānyam viśeṣa ity evam api sāmānyam viśeṣa ity evam vidhabu-
saṁbuddhyapekṣam ity arthaḥ TS ddhyapekṣam ity arthaḥ V 14.5-6
162.8-9*

Again the edition of the long version clearly has it wrong. To a large extent, the errors can be explained as resulting from confusion of similar *akṣaras* in Malayalam script.

These examples are clear enough, I believe, and they could easily be multiplied. The cases where it is the long version that appears to have a corrupt text are particularly noteworthy: if they are not due simply to error on the part of Thakur or the transcriber(s) of the Madras manuscripts they show that the transmission of the abridged version is not necessarily inferior, and that the archetype of the abridged version was free from errors that the surviving manuscripts of the long version have.

I shall now turn to a category of greater interest: discrepancies which are not obviously due to scribal or editorial error. Of what nature are these and what, if anything, can they reveal about the abridger and the way he went about his task?³⁸ It is necessary to attempt to assess all this too, as objectively as possible; again I shall try to make some first steps in this direction, but can do no more than that.

Roughly, the differences which may be due to more than mere involuntary, mechanical variation arising in the process of transmission can be classified under the following headings.

- Variation by substitution of synonyms or phrases which do not materially affect the sense or change the syntactic structure. There are quite a few cases of this: some may perhaps be scribal variation in the transmission of one or the other of the texts,³⁹ but it seems plausible that a number go back to the person who prepared the abridgement. Some examples:

³⁸ Here and in the following I attempt to distinguish between alterations which are due to 'abridgement' and those which are 'scribal' or 'arose in the course of transmission.' It should be realized, however, that the activity I attribute to the abridger in many respects resembles scribal activity. It differs, in my conception of the two, primarily in intention. The abridger had as his priority the creation of a new, much shorter state of the text, probably with a conscious idea of guidelines along which this was to be accomplished and with a definite goal in mind. The scribes may have had various different intentions, but if these included a conscious wish to produce a new state of the text which differed from that of the exemplar(s)—in distinction to a wish to recreate a more original state of the text, i.e. to correct and '(critically) edit' it—this was probably kept within rather narrow bounds by various unwritten codes. In other words, I believe that it is useful to distinguish between 'transmitters' and 'redactors' (into which group our presumed abridger would fall) of this type of text, and that there are limits to the amount of variation that the former group would deliberately introduce.

³⁹ It is certainly necessary to be aware that substitution of synonyms seems to be an element of the *usus scribendi* of the large majority of Indian scribes.

1. With change in the word-order as well:

*kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāra-
ṇam iti bhāvapradhāno nirdeśaḥ*
TS 92.4–5

*kriyāvad ityādinirdeśo bhāva-
pradhānaḥ* V 6.12

2. *brāhmaṇalakṣaṇāvagamasahitena
cakṣurādinā tadanubhava iti cet*
TS 184.10–11

*brāhmaṇalakṣaṇāvagamasahitena
cakṣurādinā tadavagama iti cet*
V 15.25

3. *na ca rūpatve pramāṇābhāvaḥ* TS
200.8

na ca rūpatve mātābhāvaḥ V
18.12

4. *agnisamyogād ity anuvartamāne
punar agnisamyogād iti niyamā-
rtham* TS 210.1

*agnisamyogād iti vartamāne
punas tadgrahaṇam niyamā-
rtham* V 19.20

5. *bhāṣyakārās tu samāne vā-
yau bhinnadikkriyayor vāyvoḥ
sammūrccchanam icchanti* TS
218.16

*bhāṣyakārās tu samāne vā-
yau bhinnadikkriyayor vāyvoḥ
sammūrccchanam ity āmananti*
V 21.3

As may be seen, the wording of the short version is usually briefer, though this is not invariably the case;⁴⁰ as a result of this it is often somewhat less explicit. On the whole I think this may be taken as supporting, though not very strongly perhaps, the supposition that the divergence is the result of the work of the abridger rather than mere scribal accident. If the latter were the case, one would expect similar scribal variation to have occurred in the transmission of both versions to roughly the same extent, and there is no good reason why scribes of the short version would consistently choose for briefer synonyms; one would imagine that instead it would be the weary copyists of the mammoth text who would tend to substitute shorter equivalents more frequently. Nor does it seem to me a very plausible theory that the longer formulations are secondary because they are sometimes more explicit, for explicitness is by no means increased in all cases of difference, and where it is, the increase is often very slight indeed.

- Omission of words which add little or nothing to the sense. This is precisely the sort of thing one would expect of someone trying to reduce Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's huge work to a more convenient size. Examples:

1. *tac ca na śāstrāntare 'sti* TS 8.11

tac ca na śāstrāntare V 2.6

2. *na caivaṃ śāṅkhādīśabda iti* TS
224.3–4

naivaṃ śāṅkhādīśabdaḥ V 23.8–
9

⁴⁰ I have of course tried to make the sample a representative one.

3. *tathā ca sparśavantaḥ pa-ramāṇavo na śabdavantaḥ sparśavattvāt, ghaṭavad iti TS* 224.30–31 *sparsavanto na śabdavantaḥ sparśavattvāt, ghaṭavat V 23.14*

Examples that illustrate simultaneously both omission and substitution of synonyms are also not difficult to find:

1. *tena dravyam iti yataḥ pṛthivyādiṣu navasu tad dravyatvam, guṇa iti yato rūpādiṣu caturviṃśatiṣu tad guṇatvam, karmeti yata utkṣepañādiṣu tat karmatvam, evaṃ sarvāsu jātiṣu draṣṭavyam* TS 176.7–9 *tena dravyam iti yataḥ pṛthivyādaḥ tad dravyatvam, guṇa iti yato rūpādaḥ tad guṇatvam, karmeti yata utkṣepañādaḥ tat karmatvam | evaṃ sarvāsu jātīṣu* V 15.14–16
2. *pratyakṣatvam cātra śrotra-pratyakṣatvam⁴² vivakṣitam* TS 225.8 *pratyakṣatvam śrotragrāhyatvam V 23.19.*

- Omission of entire discussions/digressions. This is clearly the chief method by which the size of the commentary has been reduced. Many passages, often long and sometimes very interesting ones, have been excised in the abridged version. One of the largest omissions covers about 48 and a half pages of the edition of the full version, containing almost all of the commentary on 1.1.3, with numerous digressions, including a long and important section on God and his qualities⁴³ and a number of alternative interpretations of 1.1.1–3. The abridged version has in the same place a mere two lines. There are many other cases where what is omitted is an alternative interpretation or theory (or sometimes more than one) offered by Bhaṭṭa Vāidīndra.

All this confirms the impression that the shorter version is an abridgement which attempts to remain faithful to the original, long work, though omitting many discussions found in the latter, especially those which are of less immediate relevance for the understanding of the sūtra text. However there are also a good number of places where it seems that the redactor responsible for the abridgement allowed himself liberties greater than in any of the cases we have looked at so far and actually rephrased or rewrote sentences, changing the syntactic structure and sometimes even the content. It is clearly necessary to be aware of this and to look with some

41 *sparsavanto*: em., *sparsavāḥ*: Thakur

42 *śrotragrāhyatvam*: em., *śrotra-pratyakṣatvam* Thakur

43 I have drawn heavily on this section in the brief discussion of Bhaṭṭa Vāidīndra's theology on p. 32ff. below.

care at the relevant passages. Yet again the treatment I can give them is only a preliminary one, curtailed by considerations of the space and time that a thorough study would demand. The sample given below has been made a fairly large one, because of the importance of this category for the evaluation of V, but is not by any means a complete collection.

1. *kriyāvattvaṃ na dravyalakṣaṇam, ākāśādivyāvṛttarvenāvyāpakatvād iti cet—na, kriyāvattvasya kriyāvaddravyalakṣaṇatvāt | na caivaṃ dravyalakṣaṇavānupapattiḥ, kriyāvaddravyāṇām api dravyatvena talakṣaṇasya dravyalakṣaṇatvāt | na caivaṃ prthivyādilakṣaṇānām dravyalakṣaṇatvāpattiḥ. iṣṭatvāt TS 92.5–9*

kriyāvattvaṃ na dravyalakṣaṇam, gaganādāv avyāpakatvād iti cet—na, mūrtadravyalakṣaṇatvāt, kriyāvattvena mūrtānām dravyatvaṃ āpādyā tannidarśanenākāśādīnām api tadanumānāt V 6.14–15

The differences here are appreciable; in one respect, however, they may seem at first sight greater than they are: *kriyāvaddravya* and *mūrtadravya* refer to exactly the same group of substances, viz. all but the all-pervasive ether, time, space and souls. V has adopted a more familiar term,⁴⁴ which is at the same time slightly briefer.

2. In the commentary on the list of qualities given in VS 1.1.5, Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra explains that the *sūtrakāra* uses the singular *prthaktvam*, in spite of the fact that there are as many different types of separateness as there are numbers, because he wishes to emphasize that there is a single universal 'separateness' (*prthaktvarvajāti*). Not unnaturally, in the long version the question is then asked why the *sūtrakāra* did not similarly use a singular for the preceding items in the list, *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni*.

*atha rūpaṃ rasa ityādy ekavacanam kvacid ekatvakhyāpane samā-
kiṃ na kṛtam iti cet—na, kvacid ekavacanena jātyekatve khyāpīte tatsa-
mānanyāyena rūpādijātīnām ekatva-
sya nirdhārayitum śakyatvād iti TS 67.8–10*

*kvacid ekatvakhyāpane samā-
nanyāyatayā rūpādyekatvasyāpi
śakyāvagamatvān na sarvatraika-
vacanaprasaṅgaḥ V 3.24–26*

The point made is identical in both versions, but the different wording and syntax allow V to express it in considerably fewer words.

⁴⁴ The PDhS, for instance, uses the term *mūrtadravya* but not *kriyāvaddravya*, and the same applies for Candrānanda.

3. A subsequent point discussed is the *sūtrakāra*'s choice of the plural *buddhayaḥ* in the same *sūtra*.

yad vā⁴⁵ buddhaya iti bahuvacanam jñānatvavyatirikṭā jñānaniṣṭha-
buddhivāyāntarapramāva⁴⁶ sākṣāt- pramāvasākṣātvānumittivasam-
kāratvānumittivasamśayavaviparyā- śayavaviparyayatvajāto na
vatvādijātibahuvakhyāpanārtham| sanīti gurumatanirasanārtham
tena jñānatvāntarajāto na sanīti buddhaya iti bahuvacanam V
 67.14–17 3.26–27

Again the content is substantially the same, but the version in V is somewhat shorter.

4. In the commentary on 1.1.17 (numbered 1.1.18 in Thakur's edition of the short version), *dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ dravyam kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaṃ*,⁴⁷ the question arises what new information this *sūtra* adds to what we already knew from 1.1.8. *dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante*. The redactor of the short version seems to have rewritten the passage almost entirely: as in example 2 above, the objection-answer structure has been abandoned, and the solution given is somewhat different.

dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante dravyāṇi dravyāntaram āra-
(cf. 1.1.8) iti sūtreṇedaṃ gatārtham bhante (cf. 1.1.8) iti bahūnām
iti cet—na, tasya dravyārambhaka- dravyāṇāṃ dravyakāraṇatvam
niṣṭhadravyārambhakarvādisādhā- uktam| atra tv ekaikadravyasya
rmyapratipāḍakatvād asya tattadāra- dravyaguṇakarmāpekṣayā sā-
vyaviśeṣajanyadravyaguṇakarmā- mānyakāraṇatvam pratipādyam|
ṣṭhatattaddravyaviśeṣajanyatādisā- ato na pūrvaparaprakaraṇayoh
dharmyapratipāḍanārthavāt| evam punaruktiṇām pariśaṅkāṇīyam V
uttarasūtre 'pi guṇās ca guṇānta- 9.13–15
ram ārabhante (cf. 1.1.9) ity anena
paunaruktyaṃ pariharaṇīyam iti TS
 121.1–6

⁴⁵ In the long version another explanation of the plural is given first: *buddhaya iti bahuvacanam buddhibahuvakhyāpanārtham| tena buddhir ekaiva, buddhibhedavyavahārasu cārabheda-*

⁴⁶ *vyavahāraṇaṃ mithyāvevī māyāvedāntasiddhānto nirastaḥ TS 67.13–14.*

⁴⁷ *'pramāva': MS. '[pramāte]'* Thakur

Thus in Thakur's edition of the long version, and in all other recensions of the *sūtrapāṭha*, I am inclined to regard the anomalous word-order *dravyam dravyaguṇakarmaṇāṃ sāmānyaṃ kāra-* nam of the short version (both the manuscript and Thakur's edition) as an involuntary scribal variation.

5. *tathā hi sattāpekṣayā dravyatvaṃ
viśeṣaḥ, tadapekṣayā prthivītvādi,
tadapekṣayaikadravyaniṣṭho viśeṣaḥ |
na cāntyaviśeṣātiriktavyāvartakam
asti, tatrānuvṛttatvānupapatteḥ* TS
175.25-27

*tathā hi sattāpekṣayā dravyatvaṃ
viśeṣaḥ, tadapekṣayā prthivītvādi,
tadapekṣayaikadravyaniṣṭho viśe-
ṣaḥ | tadapekṣayā viśeṣāntaram
nāsti, tatrānuvṛttatvānupapatteḥ*
V 15.9-11

In this case no significant alteration of sense has resulted. The formulation of the short version is briefer and continues the structure of the preceding clauses.

On the basis of the evidence, of which I have tried to give a representative selection, it may be concluded that Thakur's hypothesis as to the relationship of the 'anonymous' commentary to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's long commentary is basically correct. His characterization of the former as an abridgement of the latter, retaining especially the portions of direct relevance to the interpretation of the sūtras and omitting many lengthy discussions and digressions, seems to me the only plausible one. Nozawa has remarked that it is also possible that the long commentary is an expanded version of the short one instead (1974, 474(24)). This would be in principle a possibility, but the actual comparison of the two versions has convinced me that it can be ruled out. The on the whole consistent pattern of changes suggest to my mind strongly that it is the long version which is older. For, granted that someone might expand a brief commentary by adding additional discussions and making some changes, why would he bother to regularly substitute longer synonyms or take pains to make the same point with a few more words?⁴⁸ Moreover it seems unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should omit to compose one or more opening verses for a commentary on the VS, even a brief one, nor does it seem plausible to me that he should have made the commentary of another author the basis for his own fuller one, following it so faithfully as to hardly omit a word in it, and yet fail to acknowledge the fact: Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is I think too much an original scholar and idiosyncratic thinker for that.

Many of the cases where the two versions seem to differ in substance (as opposed to mere variation, usually slight, in wording) are to be explained as resulting from the defective state in which both have reached us: we have seen that consultation of the original palm-leaf manuscript of the abridged version frequently allows restoration of a text substantially closer to that of the long version, and that similarly the latter often should be corrected to agree with the abridgment. Another factor to be taken into consideration is the possibility that errors were made during the process of abridgement: for instance, in some occasions, the sense of a passage

⁴⁸ Such a procedure is perhaps just barely conceivable with some writers of this day, but whatever his faults, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra was I feel surely free of such objectionable habits.

may have been altered, even perhaps against the intention of the abridger, by the omission of certain sentences or words.

Of course this is only likely if the person responsible for the abridgement was different from Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself, and this forms a separate question that must be considered. Is this indeed the case, and if so is the abridgement none the less roughly contemporaneous with the composition of the commentary—made for instance by a student of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra for his own use—or is it a (much) later re-cast? This is of importance for our evaluation of the occasional sentences in the abridged version which do not seem to have a counterpart in the full commentary.

Thakur merely remarks on this point that the abridgment 'must have been prepared by Vādīndra himself or some of his followers for those who were interested in the purport of the sūtras and had no aptitude to enter into the abundant discussions in the *Nibandha*' (1960, 27). To settle the matter, if that is possible, would require very close study of the two texts together with the other extant works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, and would in effect almost have to be preceded by re-editing both versions. Unfortunately, considering the condition of the two texts and their transmission, the type of change or error in the shorter version that would point most strongly to the abridgement not being authorial cannot be identified with complete certainty, because it can never be excluded (and is frequently more plausible) that such differences are to be put down to scribal error. Still, if a sufficient number of such changes can be adduced, the case for a non-authorial, and perhaps non-authorized abridgement may become very strong.

Another category of clues that is worth mentioning could be gathered by looking at the linguistic usage of sentences in V which have been rewritten from the corresponding passages of the long version, and sentences in V which seem to have no counterpart there at all. It is possible that the individual style and use of language of the abridger may be detectable.⁴⁹

⁴⁹ I shall not try and pursue this approach seriously here, but may point out a single instance where a word only found in the abridged version seems slightly suspect. In the commentary on 1.1.4, *guṇāś ca guṇāntaram* (Thakur wrongly prints *guṇāntaram* as belonging to the commentary in his edition of V), the shorter version has abridged a discussion of various optional interpretations (including one in which the sūtra is divided into two independent ones). The only alternatives offered in the short version concern the interpretation of the sūtra's *ca*, and are expressed as follows: *cakārasya dvau vilāsaviśayau* | *tatraikah—na kevalam dravyāpi dravyāntaram ārabhante kim tu guṇā api, dravyārambhakasamyoḡeśvarajñānādīnām pañcādidravyajanakanvādīn—anyas tu guṇa guṇāntaram ceti* (V 5.6–8). The only words here which are found literally in the long version are *na kevalam dravyāpi dravyāntaram ārabhante kim tu guṇā api, dravyārambhakasamyoḡeśvarajñānādīnām pañcādidravyajanakanvādīn*. The word, or phrase, which I find suspicious is *cakārasya dvau vilāsaviśayau*; it is not found, as far as I see, elsewhere in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writing. Even the word *vilāsa* does not seem to occur, and the way chosen to express the existence of two alternatives is altogether rather untypical of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's very regular

Personally, without such large-scale and careful comparisons having been carried out as yet, I feel that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself probably had little or nothing to do with the preparation of the abridged version; for one thing, it seems to me 'out of character' for him to have done so. If this is true, it implies that the rare differences in V which affect the substance have no claim to representing changes in authorial intention. This does not imply that V should not be regarded as a 'version' of the long commentary, just as the text of a novel altered against the author's intentions at some points by a publisher's editor should still be regarded as a version of the author's text, and as an important witness to his intentions.⁵⁰ In any case the relationship between the two is so close and so clear that it is surprising to find it described merely with the words '[b]oth works are indebted to Udayana and use similar versions of the Sūtra text' (Halbfass 1992, 84 n.25).⁵¹

To conclude this section, I may observe that far from there being any discernible change in the style of the abridged commentary at the point where the text of the long version as we have it breaks off, it shows a high degree of consistency with the earlier portions and with the style of writing and thought that we find in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's other works. Certain turns of phrase occur which are highly typical of our author, and ideas and arguments surface which I have been only able to find in the writings of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.⁵² In short, I see no reason to doubt that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra finished his lengthy commentary on the VS, and that the later portions of the abridged version are as faithful to it as the first two *adhyāyas* are.

style.

50 Once again it may be remarked that the difference between alterations introduced by an editor, redactor or abridger and those made by a 'mere' scribe is frequently a gradual one at best (cf. footnote 38 on p. 15 above).

51 Also in the other passages of this important book where Halbfass refers to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, it appears that he regards it as a completely different text from the abridged version. Thus on p. 75, he speaks of 'several apparently older commentaries: that is Candrānanda's *Vṛtti*, Bhaṭṭavādīndra's *Vārtika*, and the anonymous commentary edited by Anantalal Thakur,' and on p. 79 he calls the abridged version 'an anonymous *Vyākhyā*, which may be several centuries older than the *Upaskāra*.' Nowhere does Halbfass give his reasons, if there are any, for differing from Thakur's judgement.

In further consideration of this subject it may perhaps be unavoidable to reflect on both ancient Indian and our modern concepts of 'versions of a text': when would an Indian author have considered a redaction a 'different text' and when should we? I have refrained from discussion of this sort of question, though not because I find them useless.

52 Cf. e.g. footnote 19 on p. 103 below.

1.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought

My interest in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's VS commentary originally arose through the importance of the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains for the study of the much vexed problems of the VS. There are however other reasons why it deserves notice, and one of these is the light it casts on its author's thought.⁵³ Before turning to the technical details of the edition presented here, something should be said about this. What is our author's importance as a philosopher, what, if any, are his contributions to the Vaiśeṣika, what influences does he show, and what influence did he have on his successors? These are questions which one has every right to ask of someone undertaking to edit even a small portion of his writings, and I shall make some attempt to deal with them here, although unfortunately I am only able to answer them in part, and with reservations. This may perhaps be pardoned, if the reader will bear in mind that to answer these questions with authority would require not merely familiarity with the works of our author himself but also an understanding of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika and their historical development, to say nothing of the other 'schools' with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra shows himself to be well acquainted,⁵⁴ far beyond mine. Nor are there many studies which would be of help in such a project:⁵⁵ as Potter justly observed almost twenty years ago, 'this post-Udayana, pre-Gaṅgeśa period has not been studied nearly as extensively as that prior to Udayana' (1977, 8).⁵⁶

53 Yet another is the references to, sometimes quotations from, works which have been lost to us, such as the commentary on the VS by Ātreya. Cf. p. 37f. below.

54 Explicit references to other authors or 'schools' in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings may be found with the index given in Appendix 4; see also p. 36ff. below.

55 As far as I can see, very little has been written about Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought. Telang's useful introduction to his edition of the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* devotes but little space to the content of the work (see especially pp. ix-x and xvi-xvii). Gopinath Kaviraj does not go further than to say that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra 'was one of the greatest polemic writers in the field of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika in mediaeval India and deserves to be ranked, so far as dialectical abilities are concerned, with Śrīharṣa and similar other writers.' (1961, 29); an encomium the value of which surely depends much on just who and how many the 'similar other writers' are. He also thinks that the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* 'was perhaps the *magnum opus* of this gifted author and created quite a sensation in his time. His great controversialist genius appears at its best in his [sic: read this?] work, where he attempts to prove the futility and defects of the so-called *mahāvīdyā* syllogisms, which played an important part in the history of mediaeval Indian Logic' (1961, 30). No attempt at an overall evaluation of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's work is made in Potter 1977.

56 In fact, even Udayana himself has by no means been studied as thoroughly as he deserves, given his acknowledged stature and historical importance. Chemparathy's work, especially the 1972 monograph, represents the best in Udayana studies. I would judge, but though Udayana's theology is certainly important and central to his thought, many other areas remain virtually unexplored. Indeed, with what is sometimes judged to be his most important work, the *Tātparyaparinuddhī*, still not published in its entirety, a definitive assessment of Udayana's philosophy is perhaps not possible at present.

With such a dearth of serious investigations of important predecessors of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra such as Vallabhācārya and Vādivāgīśvara, it is a difficult project to place Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought into historical perspective, and one which, if seriously attempted, would quickly outgrow the limits which must be imposed here.

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's three works which survive at least in part, briefly surveyed above, each have their particular character. The *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* is the only 'independent' work, in the sense that it is not a commentary on an older text. It has, however, by far the most narrow and specialized topic, one too which is not directly connected with the main themes of the Vaiśeṣika, and it is at the same time the work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's which has been summarized in most detail,⁵⁷ so I shall devote no special attention to it here. The two commentaries differ considerably in character: a difference which is to no little extent determined by the nature of the works commented on. The *Kiraṇāvalī* is a mature work by a philosopher with a strong individuality and analytic capacity, written in prose which is admittedly difficult and sometimes elliptical but with a style which is in a long tradition of śāstric commentaries. Udayana's views are pronounced and, on most points, clear enough to one trained in the texts of the school; there is admittedly much for a commentator to explain, but no very great scope for him to read theories of his own into the root-text. And what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does is indeed for the most part the work of a faithful, and it must be said a good commentator.

With the VS, matters are of course very different. The sūtras by no means cover all the themes which had come to be important elements of Vaiśeṣika by the period after Udayana, and they are of course couched in language and syntax which is elliptical and frequently very obscure. Here there is ample room for the development of the commentator's own view, whether by various exegetical stratagems by which a sūtra can be read as conveying a sense unlikely to be the original one, or by means of digressions. We find Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra using both methods at various places. As the latest surviving work of the author, it is also not unreasonable to expect that it contains his final, or at least most developed thoughts on various topics which were discussed elsewhere in his writings.

It is therefore this last work of his to which one should look first in order to determine the particular nature of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's thought. And indeed, many of the most interesting and original of our author's ideas are found more or less clearly expressed in this commentary alone. Those that come up in the abridged commentary on the sixth and seventh *adhyāyas* are briefly discussed in the annotation to the

57 Aside from the very brief account of the contents given by Telang in his introduction to the edition (1920, xvi-xvii), there is a more detailed review of the text in Solomon 1976, 225-331 and a summary by E. Sreekrishna Sarma on p. 648-652 of Potter: 1977.

translation below.⁵⁸ Here I shall attempt a brief survey of some important points, basing myself in the first place on the VS commentary and emphasizing elements which may be original in our author. After that a few notes—they are no more—are given on Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's relationship with some predecessors and his influence on later authors.

1.4.1 Ontology

Like most Vaiśeṣika authors later than Praśastapāda, Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra accepts seven categories as fundamental, adding *abhāva* to the six that were alone recognized by Praśastapāda.⁵⁹ With regard to the status of the first three, substance, quality and motion.⁶⁰ Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra has no fundamental innovations, but his treatment of universals, or rather of the highest universal 'reality'⁶¹ in particular, shows a radical departure from the earlier conception. All known earlier writers hold it virtually as an axiom that universals can occur/inhere only in substances, qualities and actions; the VS itself, though we shall see that its statements are not explicit enough to deter Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra from differing, contains passages that support this view.⁶² This led them into a conflict between the view on the one hand that reality is a universal, and

58 Perhaps the most noteworthy points are Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's espousal of *piṭharapākavāda* rather than the *pīlupākavāda* normally associated with Vaiśeṣika (cf. the commentary on 7.1.5–16) and his subdivision of *saṃyogajasanyoga* (cf. the commentary on 7.2.12). In addition to these, there are numerous more minor points where he differs from the other commentators on the explanation of a sūtra.

59 See for instance *tasmād upayoginivād dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyābhāvarūpaṃ prameyam vyūṣṭānīyam iti siddham* (TS 59.13–14).

60 Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra explicitly rejects Bhāsarvajña's proposal that motion is a quality, and not a separate category; one of the interpretations he gives of the word *aguṇam* in the sūtra defining action (1.1.16 in Thakur's edition of the TS ≈ 1.1.17 in his edition of the abridged commentary) is that it is aimed at denying such a view: *yad vā karma guṇa iti bhūṣaṇaḥ | tannirāsārtham uktam aguṇam iti, na guṇa aguṇam iti vyākhyānāt* (TS 115.22–23). This is followed by some logical arguments to prove that motion is not a quality; unfortunately Thakur's transcript is lacunose here, so that not all details can be followed. It is clear enough though that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra gives the 'explicit refutation of the Bhūṣaṇakāra's view that motion is a quality' that Potter (1977, 131) was unable to find in other Nyāya or Vaiśeṣika texts. Nor was he the first to do so, for Udayana also mentions Bhāsarvajña's radical view and rejects it with arguments—different, it seems, from Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's—in the *Kiraṇāvālī* (104.21–105.5).

61 I have adopted the translation for *satā* or *bhāva* that Halbfass prefers, to avoid confusing readers accustomed to his terminology.

62 For instance the discussion of *bhāva* at VS 1.2.7–13, makes it clear to a reader not strongly biased in favour of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's theory that 'the Vaiśeṣikasūtra ascribes *satā* or *bhāva* to the first three categories (*dravya, guṇa, karma*) only' (Halbfass 1992, 143). §.1.6 (§.5 in Candrānanda's version), *sāmānyaviśeṣe sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam*, also poses some problems for Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra; for his solution see p. 28 below.

on the other hand that not only the substances, qualities and motions in which that universal occurs but also the remaining categories 'exist' in an objective sense.⁶³ Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, however, does not agree, and offers a more radical solution to the difficulty, holding that the universal 'being' occurs in all the categories. This is a recurrent theme in his commentary on the VS, but it appears first and is argued at greatest length in the commentary on the word *sat* in 1.1.7 *sad anityam dravyavat kāryam kāraṇam sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmanām aviśeṣaḥ*.⁶⁴

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra explains the *sat* of the sūtra as referring to *sattva*.⁶⁵ equates this with *astitva* and says that it is a property that exists in all the categories and may be known through direct perception.⁶⁶ He sees no problem in equating this also with *sattā*, and denies that it cannot occur in universals and so on.⁶⁷ Even in *astitva* itself *astitva* occurs, apparently despite of the *ātmāśraya* that this amounts to.⁶⁸

It is obvious that this proposal would raise a storm of protest from more traditional Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas, and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra deals at some length with a number of possible objections. I shall give only a sample of his arguments.

The most fundamental objection, the first also that is likely to occur to one, is that if this *astitva* is a real universal, it should not occur in universals, and certainly not in itself, because this would lead to an infinite regress.⁶⁹ When this is urged against him, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first remarks that the occurrence of *astitva* in lower universals such as *dravyatva* leads to no such infinite regress. As for the *astitva* of *astitva*, he seems to have a two-fold answer; one may give up the idea (in contradiction to his own earlier espousal of it) or one may instead defend it by not admitting

63 The most important study of this problem and some of the ways in which the Vaiśeṣika attempted to deal with it is of course Halbfass' 1992 monograph; see especially chapter 6.

64 The theory put forward by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in his commentary to this sūtra seems to me so unusual and radical a departure from his predecessors that it is surprising that Halbfass merely refers to it as being 'of interest' for 'the adjustments of Praśastapāda's ontological vocabulary that were introduced after Udayana' (1992, 159; the footnote on this passage, number 118 on p. 168, refers directly to the pages of the long version of the VS commentary which are my basis here but describes their content merely as 'on *sattā*, *astitva*, *bhāvanā*, etc.').

65 *sad iti bhāvapradhāno nirdeśaḥ, sattvam ity arthaḥ* TS 68.20.

66 *sattvam astitvam sakalapadārthanīṣṭho dharmaviśeṣaḥ | tatra kiṃ: pramāṇam asti cet—pratyakṣam eva* TS 68.24–25.

67 *athāstivam sattatva, sā ca dravyaguṇakarmasveva variate | sāmānyādīṣu punar asti prapñaya bhrāntir iti cet—na, bādhakābhāvāt | na hi sāmānyādayo na santīti bādhakam udeḥ* TS 68.25–26.

68 *nanv astivam astitve variate vā na vā | prathama ātmāśrayaḥ, dvītye 'stivasya sakalapadārthavṛttivānupattiḥ, svasmād eva vyāvṛttivād iti | na, astitve 'py astitvāṅgīkāraḥ* TS 68.33–69.2.

69 'It [i.e. *sattā*] cannot be the substrate of reality or any other real universal, as this would entail an infinite regress (*anavasthā*), which classical Vaiśeṣika regards as a fatal defect' (Halbfass 1992, 144).

that this type of infinite regress is sufficient to refute it because there is no 'destruction of the basis' (*mūlakṣaṇi*).⁷⁰ i.e., presumably, because the 'first-level' *astirva* is established by perception.⁷¹

The next serious problem addressed is how *astirva* is related with (the category) inference, which is taught explicitly to be one in both the VS and the PDhS. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra first claims that the universal *astirva* is related to inference by inference itself (it inheres in inference), and finds this self-relation unproblematic.⁷² Alternatively, he is willing to admit a second inference relating *astirva* to the first one, and itself related by that first inference to *astirva*. The mutual dependency (*parasparāśraya*) this entails is again not admitted to be a fault here, as it does not prevent the entities involved from arising (i.e. existing) and being known.⁷³ Or even if yet another inference is needed (to relate *astirva* to the second one), this is unproblematic, for the first inference can then be used to relate the third with *astirva*. The circularity (*cakraka*) involved is of course not a fault, as it does not prevent the entities involved from arising (i.e. existing) and being known. Similarly Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is

⁷⁰ For the idea that *anavasthā* is not a serious fault so long as there is no *mūlakṣaṇi* cf. Jayanta Bhaṭṭa's *anavasthāpi ceyam na mūlaghāṭinī*: ... *mūlakṣaṇikarīm āhur anavasthām hi dūṣaṇam: mūlasiddhau tv arucyāpi nānavasthā nivāryate* || NM I 58.9–12.

⁷¹ *asthāstirvaṃ jātir dharmāntaramvā | jātir iti brūmah | jātyācāu jāter asambhava iti cet—na, bādhakābhāvāt | jātāu jātisvīkāre 'navasthā bādhakam iti cet—na, dravyavādāv astirvāṅgīkāre 'navasthāyā nirūpayitum śakyaṃvāt | astirve 'py astirvāntaram tatrāpy astirvāntaram ity anavastheti cet—na, astirve 'stirvāṅgīkāraṭ, mūlakṣaṇer abhāvenaivamidhānavasthāyā dūṣaṇa-trenāṅgīkāraḥ ca TS 69.22–26. Perhaps the text should be regarded as suspect here: it seems strange that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra should consider giving up the assumption of the occurrence of *astirva* in *astirva*—moreover, if my interpretation of the passage is accurate one would expect *vā* in place of the final *ca*. I do not see a plausible way to emend the passage though.*

⁷² *samavāye jātisvīkāre sambandhābhāvo bādhaka iti cet—na, samavāyābhāvayor viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabdhāvasambandhāṅgīkāraṭ | samavāye jātisvīkāre samavāyābhāvo bādhaka iti cet—na, samavāye 'pi samavāyasambhavāt | samavāyāntarasvīkāre tatrāpi samavāyāntaram ity anavastheti cet—na, tasyaiva samavāyasya tatrāṅgīkāraṭ | ātmāśrayaḥ syād iti cet—astu, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve ātmāśrayasya dūṣaṇavāṅgīkāraṭ TS 69.26–31.*

⁷³ *astu vā samavāye samavāyāntaram, tathāpi nānavasthā, dvitīye samavāye prathamāsamavāyasyaiva svīkāraṭ: na caivaṃ parasparāśrayaḥ, utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve parasparāśrayasyāpi dūṣaṇavāṅgīkāraṭ TS 70.4.*

I am not completely certain what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra means to convey with *utpattijñaptipratibandhakatvābhāve*. The word is one which he uses on several occasions, always, as far as I can see, as an argument to show that *ātmāśraya*, *parasparāśraya*, *cakraka* or *anavasthā* does not form a fault that can discredit a theory (aside from the occurrences in our passage here see TS 75.28, 81.23 and 151.24: at TS 69.2 we find the clearly synonymous *utpattipramitiipratibandhakatvābhāvena*). It appears to be related to *mūlakṣaṇyābhāve* (cf. footnote 70 above): this is born out by an occurrence in Śrīvidyācakravartin's commentary *Sampradāyaprakāśinī* on Mammata's *Kāvya-prakāśa*. Apropos of Mammata's line *evam apy anavasthā syād yā mūlakṣaṇyākārinī* (and the auto-commentary hereon) this commentator remarks *utpattijñaptyor anyatarapratibandhakatvābhāve hi nānavasthādoṣaḥ, yathā bhīṣṇkurācāu* (KP 41.34–35).

willing to posit if necessary a fourth, a fifth, or even an infinite regress and thus an infinite number of inferences; all this is by his criteria not enough to render his basic premise, the existence of the universal *astitva/sattā* in all categories, invalid.⁷⁴

Objections are next raised and answered with regard to the occurrence of *sattā* in the categories of ultimate individuators and non-existence: I shall pass over these here. The final difficulty to be surmounted is that posed by VS 8.1.6.⁷⁵ *sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam* (cf. footnote 62 above). Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra has an ingenious answer, for he says that with the word *sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt* Kaṇāda only prohibits lower universals (i.e. such as *dravyatva*), and not *sattā*, from inhering in (lower) universals. In support of this interpretation he remarks that if this had not been the intention of the sūtra it would have sufficed to have said *sāmānyābhāvāt*, and thereby prohibited all universals from occurring in universals, and thus the addition of *viśeṣa* in the compound would have no function.⁷⁶

Herewith Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra claims to have fully established his point: *astitva* is identical with the highest universal *sattā* and is common to all categories. He even quotes a sentence from Praśastapāda's PDhS which he believes supports this.⁷⁷

What Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra does here is attempt to solve an inherent difficulty in Vaiśeṣika ontology by equating what originally was a 'second-order concept',⁷⁸ which

74 *astu vā dvitīyasamavāye 'pi samavāyāntaram | tathā ca nānavasthā. tritīyasamavāye prathamā-samavāyasyaivāṅgikārāt | na catvaṃ cakrakadoṣaḥ. utpatijñāptipratibandhakavābhāve ca-krakasyādūṣanarūṭ | evaṃ caturthapañcamasamavāyābhyupagame 'pi nānavasthā | astu vānavasthā. tathāpi nāsau doṣaḥ. utpatijñāptipratibandhakavābhāve 'navasthāyā apy adūṣaṇarūṭ | samavāyānantyaprasaṅga iti cet—na, iṣṭarūṭ iti TS 70.14–19.*

75 Omitted in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's commentary, and for that reason also in Thakur's edition thereof.

76 *jātiṣu sattāṅgikāre sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam iti sūtravirodha-iti cet—na. sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvād ity anena sāmānyaviśeṣam avāntaram sāmānyam niṣedhaṭā sattāyā anīṣedhāt | anyathā sāmānyābhāvād ity etāvataiva sāmānyanīṣedhe siddhe sūtraga-ta-tata: em., tat Thakur*

77 *tat siddham sattājātir evāstivam sakalapadārthasādharmyam iti | yad uktam praśastapāda-bhāṣyakārāḥ—sā cānuvṛter eva hetuvāt sāmānyam evaṭ (PDhS 11.13–14) TS 71.5–7.*

78 *sā: em., sa Thakur*
It may be worth saying something here about the role of *astitva* in Praśastapāda's ontology, and for this I can do no better than to quote Halbfass: 'Unlike *sattā*, *astitva* covers not only sub-stances, qualities, and motions, but also universals, particularities, and inference. As a common attribute (*sādharmya*) of all six categories, it is coordinate, but not necessarily coextensive with *jñeyatva* ("knowability") and *abhidheyatva* ("nameability"). Its most basic connotation seems to be irreducible identity, identifiability, and accordingly, undeniability. . . Praśastapāda does not explain the word *astitva*, and he uses it only once in his extant work, the *Padārthadharma-saṃgraha*. . . *Astitva* is not part of the fundamental "nomenclature of the world." It is not "listed" and "named" among the categories, but used to describe and analyze them. It is a second-order concept, an abstraction. Praśastapāda sees no reason to explain this instrument of analysis and description' (1992, 144–145). On the ways in which Praśastapāda's commentators tried to come

fell outside of the supposedly all-inclusive categories, with the highest universal. This attempt to make the description and classification of really existing things as complete as possible with a small set of first-order concepts and avoiding the use of concepts at a higher (meta-) level as far as possible, inevitably entails infinite regress, circularity or *ātmāśrayaḥ* at some key points; how persuasive Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is in arguing that this does not invalidate his proposals I shall leave to philosophers to debate. No Indian thinker, as far as I know, has followed Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in this.

1.4.2 Epistemology

Like all other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra accepts as means of valid knowledge (*pramāṇa*) direct perception (*pratyakṣa*) and inference (*anumāna*). There is unfortunately no systematic discussion of the number and nature of the means of valid knowledge in the surviving corpus, but it emerges from a reading of the VS commentary that he also regards verbal authority (*śabda*) as an independent *pramāṇa*.⁷⁹ I do not assume this merely because of various references to the authority (*prāmāṇya*) of pronouncements of God (in the Veda) and other teachers such as Kaṇāda, for this is of course admitted by other Vaiśeṣikas and need not imply that this authority is an independent one—it is usually regarded as being a form of inference. But there are many passages which point in a much clearer and more definite fashion to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's acceptance of three independent *pramāṇas*. To mention but a few: at one place we read . . . *ityatra pramāṇam nāsti, pratyakṣānumānāgamāsambhavāt, pramāṇāntarasya cānaigikārāt*.⁸⁰ At another we find *yata evātmani pratyakṣam anumānam vā na pramāṇam, ata evāgamaḥ pramāṇam* (V 40.22–23); admittedly this is an opponent's suggestion, but the ground on which it is rejected is not that the underlying presupposition about the number of distinct *pramāṇas* is mistaken.

A compact review of the various types of perceptual knowledge is presented in the (abridged) commentary on VS 3.1.13 (numbered 3.1.20 in Thakur's edition). The division on the highest level is that between perception accompanied by conceptualization (*savikalpaka*) and without conceptualization (*nirvikalpaka*). The first is

to terms with the concept see Halbfass 1992, 154–158.

⁷⁹ This is admittedly a view not usually associated with the Vaiśeṣika, but Vyomaśiva also holds it.

⁸⁰ TS 158.5. The words that precede this, which should tell us in regard to what there is no *pramāṇa*, seem unfortunately to be corrupt, or rather something appears to have been lost, possibly due to eyeskip. On the strength of the context something like *bahubhiyaḥ karmabhiyaḥ saṃnyogavibhāgaḥ bhavataḥ* could be supplied.

a direct apprehension which has as its object something as qualified by something else, and is subdivided according to the ontological category to which the qualifier belongs.⁸¹ The second is direct apprehension which does not have as its object something as qualified by something else; the example given is the cognition that arises first, i.e. immediately after the contact between the sense-organ and its object, and which gives rise to the subsequent *savikalpaka* cognitions.⁸²

Doubtless it is in logic that most might be expected from our author. However, as far as I can see, there is in fact no coherent and thorough treatment of the general theory of inference in the works that we have. The *Mahāvīdyāvidāmbana* is of course a highly specialized treatise, and I shall not take it up for discussion here.⁸³ No doubt the collection of the various scattered discussions of individual logical problems and syllogisms together with an examination of the numerous syllogisms put forward on virtually every page of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings would be a worthwhile task, but it is one which I am more than happy to leave to a specialist in (Indian) logic. The only passage to which I shall briefly draw attention is in the abridged commentary on 3.1.10 (numbered 3.1.17 in Thakur's edition), where a short paragraph is devoted to a general discussion of inference; if we had the corresponding section of the full version I suspect we might well find an almost book-length treat-

81 There is an interesting point to be noted here, though it does not admit of a definitive solution at present. In the manuscript we read that this sub-division is sevenfold (*tac ca saptaavidham*), but the text continues by giving examples of only five types, according to whether the qualifier is a substance, a quality, a motion, a universal or an absence. Thakur has accordingly emended *saptaavidham* to *pañcavidham*, understandably enough. However as a textual critic I find it more plausible that the *saptaavidham* is correct—it is more likely that two cases have been lost from the list than that *pañcavidham* should have been altered to produce the inconsistency. Simple mechanical error is conceivable as a cause, for four of the five examples we have end with *ityādi* (possibly the sole exception should be emended to agree with this). But it seems potentially significant that the two missing items are the two most problematic ones; we expect examples of cognition of something as qualified by an ultimate individuator and as qualified by inherence. The omission could therefore possibly be an intentional one, though the *saptaavidham* remained, presumably overlooked, to point to the original state of affairs. Cognitions of the type that I suspect should be added are possible, though probably only to God or to yogins.

82 *īd* (scil. *pratyakṣam* or *pratyakṣajñānam*) *dvividham*—*savikalpakam* *nirvikalpakam* *cei* | *viśiṣṭaviśayaḥ sākṣātkāraḥ savikalpakam* | *tac ca saptaavidham**—*kimcid dravyaviśiṣṭaviśayaḥ yathā danḍī devadatta ityādi*, *kimcid guṇaviśiṣṭaviśayaḥ yathā śuklo ghaṭa ityādi*, *kimcid karmaviśiṣṭaviśayaḥ yathā devadattaś calatīti*, *kimcid sāmānyaviśiṣṭaviśayaḥ yathā gaur ityādi*, *kimcid abhāvaviśiṣṭaviśayaḥ yathā ghaṭasūnyaḥ bhūtaḥ ityādi* | *viśiṣṭaviśayaḥ varāhitaḥ sākṣātkāro nirvikalpakaḥ yathā prathamam viśiṣṭasākṣātkārajanajadravyādijñānam* V 37.14–20.

* *saptaavidham*: MS. [*pañca*] *vidham* Thakur. Cf. the previous note. I have not attempted to supply the two examples which I presume must have been omitted.

83 As already remarked, it is the only work of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's of which three moderately detailed summaries are available; cf. footnote 57 on p. 24 above.

ment. As it stands, Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra divides inference in the customary way into inference 'for one's self' and 'for others.' The former is independent of a formulation with the five 'members,' and only requires that one grasp the concomitance between logical ground and property to be inferred (*vyāpti*) and the fact that the logical ground is a property that belongs to the object with regard to which the inference operates (*pakṣadharmatā*). Inference 'for others,' however, consists of the well-known five members, of which Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra argues that all serve a purpose; therefore the Buddhists and Vādivāgīśvara who claim that inference 'for others' requires only two parts (corresponding to the *pratijñā* and *upanayana*) are wrong, for without knowing what the property-possessor, property to be proved and logical ground and so on are (which it is the function of the other three parts of the syllogism to make known) *vyāpti* and *pakṣadharmatā* cannot be cognized.⁸⁴

Of *śabda* or *āgama* too, and of what criteria there are for reliability of a source of verbal knowledge, I am unable to find a really systematic account. But there are passages from which it appears that the authority of Kaṇāda, for instance, is known primarily because he makes statements which can be tested and veridicated by other *pramāṇas*: it is this that lends his pronouncements authoritative status also in the cases where other *pramāṇas* cannot operate.⁸⁵ This is no different from the way the Naiyāyikas (and Vyomaśiva) see things; if pressed, Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra would presumably explain that the fact that we may use inference to establish that someone is an authoritative person (*āpta*) does not mean that that person's statements and the knowledge they generate can be subsumed under inference.

1.4.3 Theology and soteriology

I find no comprehensive treatment of theology in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's works as we have them; one has the impression that the doctrine of God was not as central a con-

84 *tad idam anumānam dvividham—svārtham parārtham ca | [tatra svārtham] pañcāvayavavākyanirapekṣam avagatavyāptipakṣadharmatāviśiṣṭam | parārtham pratijñāhetudṛṣṭāntopāyanānyāvayavāḥ | avayavatvaṃ caīṣāṃ vākyaiḥkaḍeśatvenopacārāt | na ca pratijñā niṣprajānā, parvato vahnimān ityasya parvato na vahnirahito bādhād ityevam paratvāt | na ca hetuvacanasya niṣprajānatvam, dhūmavattvasādhanaṭvākhyāpakatvena saprajānatvāt | nāpi dṛṣṭāntavacanasya niṣprajānatvam, vyāptidhījanakatvena saprajānatvāt | saugatavādivāgīśvarādayas tu yo dhūmavān asāv agnimān yathā mahānasaḥ dhūmavānś ca parvato ityāvayavadvayam eva prayoktavyam ity āhuḥ | tad ayuktam, dharmisādhyaśādhanaḍyapratītau vyāptipakṣadharmavayor avagantum aśakyaṭvāt V 36.16–24.*

85 Cf. e.g. *etiāvanty eva dravyāṇi atra kiṃ pramāṇam iti cet—sūtrakāravacanam eva | na* tai pramāṇam iti cet—na, abādhitānubhavanakatvasya prāmāṇyasya kaṇādavacanatvenāgnyuṣṇatā** pratipādakakaṇādavacanavad anumānāt TS 63.4–6.*

* na: em.. om. Thakur ** °uṣṇatā: em.. °uṣṇaka° Thakur

cern for him as it is for Udayana, and unlike his illustrious predecessor our author shows I believe little sign of personal devotion. Nonetheless, problems connected with God, His qualities, and His interaction with men and other existing things inevitably come up not infrequently in the VS commentary, which after all ranges through virtually all the topics of Vaiśeṣika philosophy. In most of these occasional discussions there is nothing that goes against Udayana's theology, but there are passages which reveal that, again, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra holds some views that seem to be unique.

God (*īśvara*, *parameśvara* or *mahādeva*) is for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as for other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas, Śiva, who periodically creates and destroys the universe⁸⁶ and who, by means of his qualities, is a cause of everything in it (cf. e.g. the commentary on 6.1.7 and footnote 26 on p. 85 below). Aside from this function as Creator, He interacts with the world of men above all in His role as teacher; He is the *dharmopadeṣṭṛ* for everyone (cf. e.g. the commentary to 6.2.2), whether directly, in the case of favoured sages such as Kaṇāda, or via the body of teachings of which He is the author, alone, as He is of the Veda, or together with a human teacher, as of the VS (cf. footnote 27 on p. 9 above). It is also God who at creation teaches the conventions of language (i.e. Sanskrit) to the first men, who have no human *vṛddhas* to learn from (cf. the commentary on 6.1.3 and footnote 18 on p. 82). I find no mention of God as teacher of other human usages (cf. Chemparathy 1972, 95–97), but doubtless Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra would have agreed that this too is one of His works.

Thus far there is nothing extraordinary. It is when we come to the question of the qualities of the Lord that we encounter Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's unconventional views. The positions we find in other Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya authors as to the number of qualities of God may be briefly summarized as follows.⁸⁷ Pakṣilasvāmin ascribes to God the qualities *dharmā*, *jñāna*, *saṁādhi* and *aiśvarya*, betraying, as Chemparathy justly remarks (1971, 169), influence of Sāṃkhya-Yoga conceptions of God. Praśastapāda, though his surviving work is not completely explicit on the subject, probably admitted at least eight qualities in God (Chemparathy 1971, 170–171): the five general qualities belonging to all substances (number, size, separateness, conjunction and disjunction) and those of cognition, desire and effort/will (*prayatna*). Uddyotakara ascribed to God six qualities (the five general ones plus cognition), but shows an inconsistency in elsewhere also attributing desire and *aiśvarya* to Him (Chemparathy 1971, 172–173 and 178–179). The large majority of Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas however held that He has eight qualities, viz. those which Praśastapāda

86 It should be understood that destruction consists of the dissolution of all constructed things; the eternal substances—ether, time, space, souls and the atoms—are not destroyed.

87 I draw on the convenient and reliable survey given in Chemparathy 1971; cf. also Chemparathy 1972, 179–182.

probably attributed to him: the five general ones, cognition, desire and *prayatna*. Only Jayanta Bhaṭṭa adds to these *dharma* and pleasure, arriving at a total of ten qualities in the Lord (Chemparathy 1971, 175–176 and 179–180).

We find Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's view on the qualities of God most clearly expressed in the course of a discussion in the long version of the commentary on VS 1.1.3. Having maintained that the Veda is pronounced by God who takes on a body for that purpose,⁸⁸ Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra imagines an opponent asking for clarification of this notion of God's body, presenting three possibilities, all of which are said to be problematic. If any body which is directly governed by God's will (*prayatna*) may be called God's body,⁸⁹ then even the body of a non-authoritative person (*anāpta*) could be a body of God, since all things are the object of God's direct will, so this feature would be inconclusive (i.e. it would not be the case that what is spoken by God in an embodied form would be automatically authoritative).⁹⁰ If a body of God is that with which He has experience (*bhogāyatana*), this would lead to the absurd consequence that God would experience pleasure and suffering. If it is the locus of sense-organs that produce God's cognitions, it would follow, undesirably, that God has cognitions which are produced.⁹¹ To this Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's answer is a surprising one; rather than choosing to defend the first of these options, as Udayana does, he appears to accept simultaneously the second and the third, and the consequences which go with them. He admits that the Lord has produced, non-eternal cognition⁹² as well as pleasure and suffering (produced for instance respectively through union with and separation from the Goddess his consort); after all the Purāṇas speak of the embodied Lord as having all these. To the objection that the Lord having no *dharma* and *adharma* surely He cannot have pleasure and suffering, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra coolly

88 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra merely uses the word *śarīra*, not, as Udayana does, *upakaraṇaśarīra* or *nirmāṇakāya* (cf. Chemparathy 1972, 152).

89 This appears to be Udayana's position, when essentially the same three *vikalpas* are discussed in the *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. See Chemparathy 1972, 143.

90 It is of course this question of authority that underlies the entire discussion.

91 For Udayana this would be unacceptable—God's cognitions must be unproduced and eternal; see Chemparathy 1972, 166–175.

92 Another passage where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra reiterates this position of his in an even stronger form, denying that God has eternal cognitions, may be found in a long discussion about numbers and their arising in the long commentary ad VS 1.1.24; see . . . *īśvarāpekṣābuddher anityatvācca* | *na caivam īśvare 'nityajñānāpatih, iṣṭatvāt* | *na caivam īśvare nityajñānābhyupagama-virodhaḥ. nityajñānasyānabhyupagamāt* | *na* * *caivamvidhāpekṣābuddhau pramāṇābhāvaḥ. etatparamāṇvekatvaviṣayaitaddvitiyaparamāṇvekatva* * * *viṣayatvarahitaitadekatvaviṣayaitatparamāṇudvayaikatvavyatiriktaikatvaviṣayatvarahitakāryasākṣātkāravīṣayaḥ. meyatvāt, ghaṭavad ity anumānāt* | *na ca śarīradikāraṇābhāvāt parameśvare kāryajñānānutpatih, śarīrāder abhyupagamāt* | *tathā ca—bhagavantam umākāntam candracūḍam trilocanam* | *śrutiśrūṭipurāṇāni vadanti parameśvaram* || (TS 134.25–32).

* *na*: conj., om. Thakur ** **paramāṇvekatva**: em., **paramāṇvaikatva** Thakur

replies that he accepts God as having both *dharma* and *adharma* too. Once more it is Purāṇic literature that he adduces as proof, for there we read of Śiva's *dharma* that arises from his *tapas* and his *adharma* resulting from his decapitation of Brahmā.⁹³

Another objection: if even God experiences pleasure and suffering and so on, he would be no different from ordinary people such as we are. No, replies Bhaṭṭa Vādindra, the difference is that He cannot have false cognitions, is the agent of creation and destruction, composes the Veda, is Lord over all the worlds and the like. Otherwise (if all this is not admitted to form a difference) one might as well say that a king is no different from the lowest of wretches. All this then being regarded as established, it is now clear also that it is not the case that there is no good reason for God to act as He does in composing the Veda and so on, for it is accepted that He may thereby acquire *dharma*, pleasure and so on.⁹⁴

Bhaṭṭa Vādindra next mentions and rejects the view of Ātreya,⁹⁵ who admits God to have *dharma* and a body and pleasure arising therefrom, but does not credit

93 *atha kiṃ sākṣādīśvaraprayatnādhiṣṭhitatvam īśvaraśarīratvam, kiṃ veśvarabhogāyatanaṭvam, kiṃ veśvarajñānanakendriyāśrayatvam* | *prathamē 'nāptaśarīratvāpīśvaraśarīratvam, sarvapadārthānāṃ sākṣādīśvaraprayatnaviṣayaṭvād iti tāstatham evānaikāntikatvam* | *dvitīye parameśvare 'pi sukhaduḥkhāpatih | tṛtīye parameśvare kāryajñānādyāpatir iti cet—na, parameśvare* ** *giriśambhogaviyogajanyasukhaduḥkhakāryajñānādyāngikārāt purāṇādaugiriśambhogaviyogajanyaduḥkhendriyajñānādisālino vighrahavata eva candrasēkhara-sya śraṇāt | dharmādharmaḥbāve katham īśvarasya sukhaduḥkhādīnī cet—na, īśvare dharmādharmaḥ apy āngikārāt, purāṇādaugiriśambhogajanyaduḥkhendriyajñānādisālino vighrahavata eva candrasēkhara-sya śraṇāt | TS 41.14–23.*

* *veśvarajñānanakendriyāśrayatvam*: conj.. *veśvarajñānanakendriyāśrayatvam* Thakur ** *parameśvare*: MS, *parameśvara*° Thakur

The 'MS' on the basis of which this correction is made is one of the Madras manuscript fragments: about one third of the leaf is gone, so it does not preserve the passage complete.

94 *sukhaduḥkhādīmatve parameśvarasyāsmadādibhyaḥ ko viśeṣa*° *iti cet—na, abhīrāntasr-ṣṭisamhārakartṛtvavedanīrmitṛvasakalabhuvanasvāmitvādikam ity avehi | anyathā sukhaduḥkhādīmatve rājño 'pi pāmarādibhyo viśeṣo na syāt | deśasvāmyaviśiṣṭavaniśambhogajanyasukhadayaḥ pāmarādibhyo rājño viśeṣa ity cet—na, evaṃ tarhi viśvasvāmyagiriśambhogajanyasukhadayo rājādibhyaḥ parameśvarasyaviśeṣa ity samtoṣṭavyam | etena vedādinirmāṇe*°° *parameśvarasya prayojanābhāva ity pratyuktam, parameśvare vedādinirmāṇajanyadharmasukhāder āngikārād iti**** *TS 41.23–29.*

* *ko viśeṣa*: MS, [na] *ko 'pi viśeṣa* Thakur ** *vedādinirmāṇe*: MS, *vedādinirmāṇe* Thakur *** *āngikārād iti*: MS, *āngikārāt* Thakur

The suggestion in this passage that God's activity in composing the Veda and so on may have as its goal his own *dharma* and pleasure, in other words be *svārtha* and not *parārtha*, is quite surprising: it forms yet another significant difference with Udayana's view. Bhaṭṭa Vādindra does not seem quite consistent in this, however: at least in one of the passages discussing the composition of the VS he claims that the *prayojana* herein is *paragatau svargāpavargau*, and gives as a parallel the activity of God, who is eternally liberated (and hence has nothing that he could require), in composing the Veda. Furthermore God too (together) with Kaṇāda is a composer of the VS. Cf. the second of the passages quoted in footnote 27 on p. 9 above.

95 On Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's references to and citations from this author see p. 37 below.

his having *adharma* and a body and suffering arising therefrom.⁹⁶ This is not the case, for on the basis of the Purāṇas and so on his *adharma* and suffering can be established in the same way as his *dharma* and pleasure. In a similar fashion one must also accept that God has mental traces (*saṃskāra*) and aversion as well, so that the conclusion is that He has the qualities cognition, pleasure, suffering, desire, aversion, will, *dharma*, *adharma* and mental traces—in addition presumably to the five general qualities number, size, separateness, conjunction and disjunction which are not mentioned explicitly here but which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra can hardly have rejected as qualities of God.⁹⁷

This is a rather surprising passage to find in the writings of someone who had read the *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. It clearly brings out the difference in temper between Udayana and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra; the latter's conception of God, apparently under the influence of the 'popular' mythology of the Purāṇas, is one in which God's difference from humans has been reduced so far that it is almost only one of degree—He is different from kings in much the same way that kings are different from the lowest of men.

There is little in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's soteriology—a subject which is not treated at length anywhere in the surviving works—that seems worth drawing particular attention to here. Liberation itself he holds with other Vaiśeṣikas to be a state in which the specific qualities of the soul are extirpated; suffering is then absent but pleasure is as well (see the commentary on 6.2.20). Of the path to liberation we find no systematic or detailed account. At different places Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra speaks of various different factors as producing liberation: *dharma* (as in the commentary on 1.1.2), more specifically *yogajadharma*,⁹⁸ direct knowledge of the true state of af-

96 Ātreya, if he indeed admitted *dharma* and pleasure as qualities of God, also had a view which appears to have no parallel among the other Vaiśeṣikas and Naiyāyikas. Though the sentences mentioning and refuting Ātreya's view were quoted by Thakur in his 1969 article (p. 490), he did not draw attention to the unusual nature of the theories of both Ātreya and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

97 *ātreyācāryās* "tu paramēśvare dharmatajjanyaśarīrasukhādini manyante, na tv adharma-tajjanyaśarīraduḥkhādīnti | tad ayuktam, dharmasukhādisādhakadharmigrāhakānumānādīpuraṇāder adharmaduḥkhādāv api tulyatvāt | evaṃ smṛtihetusaṃskāradveṣāv api dharmigrāhakānumānādībalāt paramēśvare svīkṛtavyau | tasmāt buddhisukhecchādveṣaprayatnadharmā-dharmasaṃskāravān paramēśvara iti TS 41.30–34.

* *ātreyācāryās*: MS. *ātreyācāryas* Thakur

98 This comes out in more than one place; for example *ayaṃ* (scil. *muktijanaka-guṇaḥ*) *dharmavādihāraḥ. duḥkhājanakagurutvarahitāsmatpratyakṣaṇiṣṭhaguṇatvāvāntarajātīmattvarahitaguṇatvāt*, * *vakṣyamāṇasukhajanakavat* | *na ca* ** *sukhajanakatvam upādhiḥ. mokṣahetor yogajadharmaśyāḡamahāsiddhihetutvena sukhajanakatvāṅgikārāt* (TS 11.18–20).

* *rahitagūṇatvāt*: em.. * *rahitaṃ guṇatvāt* Thakur ** *na ca*: conj., om. Thakur

fairs (*tattvasākṣātkāra*)⁹⁹ and direct knowledge of the soul.¹⁰⁰

God also seems, in some cases at least, to play an important role in the process, if we can take seriously the passage where Kaṇāda is said to have attained all the goals of men, which would include liberation, through the Lord's grace.¹⁰¹ Also, since He is apparently capable of producing direct awareness in favoured humans such as Kaṇāda, and since it is direct awareness that brings about liberation, it is natural that He should be able to intervene in this way. On the other hand it is quite likely that on this point too Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has not attempted to form a systematic theory.¹⁰²

1.4.4 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's relation with other philosophers

References to other philosophers or philosophical schools are very numerous in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings; often, though not always, the individual or group that our author has in mind is explicitly named.¹⁰³ I confine myself here to a few remarks on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's references to some of his more important predecessors.

Kaṇāda The sage to whom the authorship of the VS is ascribed is always referred to with respect by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, frequently with the term *bhagavān* and once with his name prefixed by *paramapūjya* (GKṬ 60.2). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra regards him as having acquired direct awareness of *dharma* and so on (i.e. *de facto* of everything) through the favour of God, who in the form of an owl taught him the VS and gave him the injunction to teach *dharma* (i.e. by propagating the VS, of which both Kaṇāda and God can be called composer); cf. footnote 27 on pp. 9f. above. In keeping with this view of how the VS was composed, it is the Vaiśeṣika text that comes closest to being regarded as an unquestionable authority by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra.

99 Cf. e.g. *ayaṃ* (scil. *dharmah*) *guruvajātīrahitaḥ mokṣajanakatvāt, tattvasākṣātkāraṇaḥ* TS 10.30–31.

100 Cf. e.g. *yatra na granthasamāptis tatra katham namaskārajanyadharmavināśaḥ phalavināśyativād dharmasyeti cet—nimittakāraṇadehavināśāt, mocakātmāsākṣātkārād vā* TS 1.25–27.

101 Cf. *parameśvaraprasādāsāditasakalapuruṣārthasya bhagavataḥ sūtrakārasyātmagāmiphalābhāvāt* TS 8.16–17.

102 Udayana too appears not to have attempted to work out this point thoroughly, but seems on the whole to admit a mediate role of God in bringing about liberation: see for a discussion of this point Chemparathy 1972, 155–156.

103 See the index in Appendix 4 for an attempt at a complete listing. For a much less complete list of references in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's works see Thakur 1960, 30–31, and for some remarks on a few of the authors and schools referred to see p. 28–30 of the same article.

In some respects this is little more than lip-service, however; the sūtras lend themselves by their lack of explicitness and clarity to being interpreted in such a way that it is not necessary for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra to disagree with them. Despite this it is interesting, and perhaps a little amusing, to see that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra feels free to question the appropriateness of a sūtra or its wording at a few places.

Praśastapāda The author of the most important systematical text of the Vaiśeṣika is referred to regularly. At some places Praśastapāda is quoted as an authority to justify one of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's statements, even if an unprejudiced reader cannot accept it as likely that Praśastapāda would really have agreed.¹⁰⁴ Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra prefers therefore to read his own views into Praśastapāda's writings, if possible, and thus be able to claim his sanction rather than openly disagree with him. Nonetheless, at a few places we do find a clear statement to the effect that Praśastapāda is mistaken; see for instance the commentary on 7.1.12 below.¹⁰⁵

An interesting point which emerges from the same commentary passage is that if Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is to be understood literally he must have had access to or knowledge of the contents of a work by Praśastapāda that is no longer available; cf. footnote 28 on p. 107 below.

Ātreya Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS is perhaps the most important source of information on and quotations from the lost commentary by Ātreya on the VS. The references have been collected, with some brief notes, by Thakur in an article presented at the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi 1962, and published in the Proceedings of that conference in 1969. This is a useful source, though the texts quoted should be checked against Thakur's later edition of the *Tarkasāgara*, as there are some discrepancies. In another respect too caution is advised; Thakur includes in the list of passages also some which do not refer to Ātreya by name but only mention a *bhāṣyakāra*. I am far from being completely convinced that these really belong in such a list. Usually it is Praśastapāda who is referred to by this epithet, and although the passages in question (nos. 13 and 16 in Thakur's list) are not found in the PDhS, we have just seen that there are other signs that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may have had access to another work by Praśastapāda. Nor can it be excluded that here some other author yet is meant.

104 Cf. e.g. footnote 77 on p. 28 above.

105 And, for another example, *dravyādīnām pañcānām samavāyitvam anekatvaṃ [ca] sādharmyam iti praśastapādāḥ* (cf. PDhS 16.18) | *tan na...* TS 81.5–6.

As Thakur remarks (1969, 490) Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra seems never to agree with Ātreya, and in most places explicitly refutes him.

Bhāsarvajña Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra refers to this author and his famous *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* some ten times, as far as I have noted, though never using the name Bhāsarvajña. These references are often critical; they concern Bhāsarvajña's radical proposals to revise Vaiśeṣika ontology. Thus his view that motions are qualities and do not form a separate category (cf. footnote 60 on p. 25 above), and that separateness is not an independent quality (cf. TS 144.28–145.19) are rejected. It is worth remembering though that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's pupil, Bhaṭṭa Rāghava, commented on Bhāsarvajña's *Nyāyasāra*, admittedly a work which does not stray as clearly from the fold of the orthodox Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika as the auto-commentary *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* does.

Udayana Udayana's influence on Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is doubtless great, and the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* shows the respect which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra had for him. Clearly, though, this did not prevent Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra from differing from the *ācārya* often enough. While commenting on the *Kiraṇāvalī* these differences are not often brought to the fore,¹⁰⁶ either out of respect or perhaps because on some points it was only later that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra came to his own independent conclusions. In the commentary on the VS, however, on more than one occasion Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not hesitate to explicitly refute a position of Udayana's,¹⁰⁷ and at one place when a hypothetical opponent raises an objection to a proposition on the grounds that Udayana and others hold an opposite position, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra roundly states that he does not accept 'Udayana and others' as authoritative (*prāmāṇika*).¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ But see for instance the case considered in footnote 19 on pp. 103f. below.

¹⁰⁷ E.g. when he writes *udayanādayas tu nyūnādhikasamkhyāvyavacchedārtham vibhāgavacanā ity āhuḥ | tad ayuktam, vibhāgavacane prthivyādiviśeṣaṇatvena navasamkhyānupādānāt tannyūnādhikasamkhyāvyavacchedāsambhavāt, prthivyādiṣu navasamkhyāyā durghaṭarvāc ca* (TS 60.23–25).

¹⁰⁸ The point at issue arises in the course of a fascinating discussion in the long version of the commentary on 1.1.3, which starts with the authority of the Veda and wanders via the question of the body assumed by God to produce the Veda to that of the Veda's endurance from creation to dissolution. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra arrives at the position that the sounds and words of the Veda, uttered by God at the time of creation, continue to exist up to the dissolution of the cosmos, though they are not perceived: *etena sṛṣṭyādāv utpannā varṇāḥ padāni yāvat samhūram anuvartante, vyañjakābhāvāc ca nopalabhyata iti samādheyam* (TS 44.32–33). This is in contradiction with the ordinary Vaiśeṣika standpoint that sounds and therefore words that are uttered too last but a moment, so an objection is raised—and answered: *varṇapadavākhyānām āśutaravināśitvābhyupagamāḥ, vināśitvāmātrābhyupagamāḥ | udayanādibhir āśutaravināśitvam āngikriyata iti cet—na, asmābhir udayanādīnām prāmāṇikatvānaṅgikārāt, sūtre cāśutaravināśitvāpratipa-*

It would of course be of particular interest to compare Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in some detail with the post-Udayana authors who he knew, especially Vallabhācārya and Vādivāgīśvara. This is something which must be postponed; let me just say that it is my impression at present that the latter may have been a significant influence on our author, although the direct references to him are, again, all critical, and indeed the two differ on many important points.

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's influence on later authors is again a subject which would require an extensive investigation. Telang has usefully collected the explicit references to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra that can be found in other writers' works (1920, 35–38); there seems to be a preponderance of Southern writers among these. While the *Mahāvīdyāviḍambana* clearly was a work that was well-studied, the same does not appear to have been the case for Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentatorial writings. The manuscripts of his VS commentary (both versions), it may be recalled, are all Malayalam ones, whereas the manuscripts of the two parts of the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* appear to be both Devanāgarī ones, and are preserved in Northern libraries. Direct references to either commentary by later writers do not seem to have been uncovered as yet. As far as I can see, the original ideas Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra sets forth in the VS commentary have been neither adopted by others—even in the work of his pupil Bhaṭṭa Rāghava I have not found them adhered to—nor explicitly taken up for refutation. Of course it is possible that this picture may change, and that works presently unpublished or unavailable to me may turn out to have been influenced by or to react against Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's innovative Vaiśeṣika.

1.4.5 Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style

Something should perhaps be said under this heading too; after all even in technical, śāstric, literature the way a writer chooses to express himself may be of importance for an understanding of the particular nature of his thought, as well as being of philological and linguistic interest. Elsewhere I have called Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style 'heavily influenced by Udayana' (Isaacson 1990, 14 footnote 10), and that statement is not without some justification.¹⁰⁹ Thus the way in which different possible answers to a particular question (*vikalpas*) are formulated and then treated one by one is very similar.¹¹⁰ and the structure of many of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's compounds

ter iti (TS 44.33–45.3).

109 As far as I can see the only attempt to describe Udayana's style in some detail is the section on 'Characteristics of composition and style' in Chemparathy 1972, 39–44. Careful studies of the prose style of Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas are even rarer than investigations of their thought.

110 The use of *vikalpas* on a large scale is in itself a stylistic feature that goes back at least to Jayarāśi, several centuries before Udayana ('Jayarāśi certainly did not invent this form of reasoning, but

resembles those used by Udayana, especially in the *Lakṣaṇāvalī*. I should however also have said something about the differences between the two. Most striking is perhaps the relative freedom and versatility of Udayana's writing compared with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, where a rather limited set of syntactic patterns and turns of phrase is repeated over and over again, with only minimal variations for relief. I have not noticed any *laukikanyāyas* for instance, with which Udayana regularly enlivens his material, and few similes. Even in criticism of opponents Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is markedly less inventive.

To bring this preliminary rough survey of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra as a philosopher to an end; it is clear that our author is a highly original thinker. He cannot however be said to be a great one, and I find it not surprising that it is chiefly for his work on the *mahāvidyā* syllogisms that he is remembered. The most radical of his new ideas, his attempt to equate *astitva* and *sattā*, is one which is more original than perceptive, and the way it is defended smacks I think more of the clever debater than the consistent and careful theorist.

1.5 The new edition and its basis

A new edition is presented below of two *adhyāyas* of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. From a perusal of it, it will I think become clear that the entire text deserves a fresh treatment. It should be noted, however, that to re-edit the first two *adhyāyas*, it would be vital to also take into consideration the evidence of the long version, which we have in almost complete form for that part of the work; or, even better perhaps, the two should be edited together.

The *adhyāyas* I have chosen to work on here present a marked contrast: *Adhyāya* 6 contains little technical Vaiśeṣika material, dealing largely with questions related to *dharma* and liberation, but is thereby perhaps all the more interesting for a somewhat wider audience. It contains many clear or hidden links with other, more familiar, lines of development in Indian thought; I have not attempted to explore these in any detail. Wezler has announced a monograph to be devoted to this *adhyāya*, in which it may be hoped that more justice will be done to its contents.¹¹¹ The

no one before him used this way of arguing with such persistence and ingenuity, and nowhere before was the full force of this reasoning brought to light' Franco 1994, 14). But I have not noticed anyone before Udayana who, having formulated the alternatives, proceeds (not always, but frequently enough) to number them individually in the following section treating and refuting them in detail, with formulations such as *na prathamah... na dvitīyah... or pratham...*

¹¹¹ See Wezler 1982b, 96 n. 31 and Wezler 1985, 282.

seventh *adhyāya*, on the other hand, contains a number of separate discussions of particular qualities and problems connected therewith, and is much more technical in nature.

1.5.1 The manuscript of the abridged version

As far as I have been able to determine, the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS is preserved in a single manuscript written on palm-leaves and in early Malayalam script. The existence of the manuscript was reported for the first time in 1952, in a very brief article by V. Venkatarama Sharma, who writes in a way that seems to imply that the manuscript was actually owned by him.¹¹² In the English introduction of the *editio princeps* of our text, Thakur describes his manuscript basis as follows.

The commentary on the Vaiśeṣikasūtras of Kaṇāda, presented in the following pages, is based upon a transcript from a single Malayalam manuscript prepared and supplied to us by the late lamented scholar, V. A. Ramaswami Śāstrin, Professor of Sanskrit, Travancore University (Retired) and lately of the Dictionary Department, Deccan College, Poona. The manuscript was first described in the Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, Vol. I. 1952, pp. 225–7, by Mahopādhyāya Paṇḍita V. Venkatarama Sharma, Vidyābhuṣaṇa [sic], Department of Sanskrit, Travancore University. The transcript shows that the manuscript ends with the first Āhnika of the 9th Adhyāya while the Vaiśeṣikadarśana consists of ten Adhyāyas of two Āhnikas each. The name of the author or of the commentary does not appear anywhere. We have called it the Vyākhyā for the sake of convenience. The manuscript appears to be full of lacunae and occasional mistakes. Sometimes big passages seem to have been omitted through carelessness of the scribe. (p. 7)

The Sanskrit introduction (*bhūmikā*) has a roughly corresponding passage.

*atrālabanaṃ malayalipinibaddhā tālīpatravilikhitā granthapātaba-
hulā navamādhyāyādyaṅnikāntā ekaiva mātṛkā | na mātṛkāntarodanto
'nviṣyatām asmākaṃ śrutipatham apy āgataḥ | mātṛkeyam anantaśa-
yanaviśvavidyālayaprādhyāpakacarasya paṇḍitadhaureyasya divaṃ-
gatasya vi° e° rāmasvāmīśāstrimahodayasyāntika āsīt | tenaivātiyatne-*

112 'Recently I was able to procure a palmleaf manuscript containing an unknown commentary (*vṛtti*) on the Vaiśeṣika-sūtras, with the text.' Sharma 1952, 226.

nāsyāḥ pratilipir devākṣaramayī saṃpādyāsmabhyam samarpitā!
(p. 23)

This provides some additional information, such as the fact that the manuscript is a palm-leaf one¹¹³ and that the transcript (*pratilipi*) used by Thakur was in Devanāgarī, and is more precise in saying that the manuscript is written in Malayalam script, instead of calling it a 'Malayalam manuscript.' The wording . . . *rāmasvāmīśāstri-mahodayasyāntika āsīt* suggests, more strongly than the English passage does, that Śāstrin owned the manuscript. Finally, only the Sanskrit version explicitly states that though another manuscript of the commentary was sought for, Thakur did not learn of the existence of any.

Considering the fact that this unique manuscript was evidently in private possession when Sharma's brief account of it was written and when the transcript of it was made for Thakur, we may consider it a very fortunate circumstance that it is still in existence. All too many manuscripts owned by learned pandits have been lost forever over the last decades, thrown into rivers or disposed of in some other fashion after the death of their owners.¹¹⁴ For this reason I was not optimistic when I first set out to try and track down the manuscript, with only the scanty published information about it as a guide, and my delight was all the greater when it was discovered that the manuscript has now passed into the relatively safe keeping of the famous Kerala University Manuscripts Library.¹¹⁵ The route by which the manuscript, which now is numbered 21600C, came into the library's collection is not completely clear. It is among the more recent acquisitions, and has not yet been catalogued. According to the library's records, its last owner was K.V. Sharma. There can however be little doubt that this is indeed the very same manuscript which was described by V. Venkatarama Sharma and transcribed for Thakur; for that the manuscript agrees too closely with the edition. For instance, the lacunae in the edition which Thakur usually attempts to fill up by conjecture nearly always correspond to the places where text has been lost due to the margins of the palm-leaf manuscript being broken.

113 As had been mentioned by Sharma (1952, 226).

114 In this the breakdown of family tradition, as children of traditional scholars turn to other professions as an economic necessity, has doubtless played an important role.

115 I call this 'relatively safe keeping' because, though the risk of a manuscript in this collection being deliberately disposed of is no doubt very small, the circumstances in which the manuscripts are kept were, when I visited the library in 1991, somewhat alarming. In another important *codex unicus*, the manuscript of Bhārucci's commentary on the *Manusmṛiti*, I myself saw worms at work, further destroying the already damaged codex, when it was taken out and unwrapped for me. Of course it is largely the inadequate financial resources of this and other manuscript libraries that is to blame for the fact that so little is done towards conserving such treasures.

1.5.2 Description of the manuscript

Having consulted the manuscript only from photographs, I am unable to give anything close to a codicologically thorough description here.

The condition of the manuscript seems to have deteriorated but little from the time that the transcript Thakur used was made. The margins of most of the leaves are damaged, frequently resulting in the loss of a few *akṣaras*, but in some cases rather more than that. Only in a few places does it appear that syllables which were in Thakur's transcript, and hence presumably legible in the palm-leaf manuscript when the transcript was made, have now been lost, as a result of further crumbling of the margins. Several folios have been considerably darkened, most probably due to the effects of smoke, but this has not led to the text becoming illegible. There are a few worm-holes, but for a manuscript of its presumed age, it seems to have suffered relatively little from such vermin; occasionally an *akṣara* or two is lost or damaged.

There are nine lines of writing on each side, the top or bottom one being often rather shorter than the rest, due to the not perfectly regular shape of the long palm-leaves. The leaves have two symmetrically placed string-holes, which do not show too many signs of wear. Around the left one a roughly rectangular space is left open, lines 3–7 of the writing having been interrupted for this purpose.

In addition to the commentary we are concerned with, it contains the *Nyāya-dīpāvalī* and a commentary thereon; this precedes our text, which covers folios 110–147. At the end, some stray folios occur containing part of the end of Śaktibhadra's well-known play, the *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi*; these probably originally belonged to a different manuscript. At no place is there any information about the time or place in which the manuscript was copied.

1.5.3 The script and the scribe

The hand is early Malayalam; though the script is a most uncertain basis for dating, I would hazard that it may have been written in the seventeenth century.¹¹⁶ It should be remembered though that there still is no thorough study available of Malayalam manuscript-palaeography.¹¹⁷ A single feature to which attention may be drawn is

116 In this guess I find myself in agreement with Sharma's estimate of the age of the manuscript as some three hundred years (cf. Sharma 1951, 226).

117 Burnell's classic work on South-Indian palaeography, which still has not been superseded, particularly with regard to manuscript palaeography, treats Malayalam (which he refers to as Western Grantha) in a rather inadequate fashion, in my opinion; one has the impression that Burnell did not really work much with, or enjoy working with, Malayalam manuscripts. Note for instance his remark 'MSS. from Malabar proper are generally written in a very irregular sprawling

that medial *au* consists merely of a stroke after the consonant sign, and does not also have one before it; I have been unable to find mention of this in the literature available to me.

Aside from having a hand which is aesthetically pleasing, the scribe seems in no way a remarkable one. The only punctuation marks used are occasional small dots (as is customary in manuscripts in Malayalam script), and these actually form a useful feature of the manuscript, for in the large majority of cases they are placed before or after a *sūtra*, so that it seems clear that their main function was to distinguish the *mūla* text from the commentary. In the cases where they are not so placed, it is often plausible that the scribe mistook a sentence in the commentary for a *sūtra*.

The folios are numbered in the left margins of the recto sides with letter-numerals according to the *nannādi* system. Only on a few leaves has the numbering been preserved complete, however, due to crumbling of the margins; often it is lost altogether. In colophons the scribe regularly uses a sign which should probably be regarded as a developed, stylized, form of *śrī* (cf. Burnell 1878, 82).

1.5.3.1 Scribal errors and corrections

The manuscript has more than a few obvious scribal errors, and these are rather unevenly distributed, a fact which may perhaps be due to lapses of concentration or tiredness. In addition, there are of course many places where one suspects an error, but without being absolutely certain of it or of its precise nature.

I have tried to discuss important and doubtful cases in the notes to the translation. Among the errors,¹¹⁸ individual and recurrent, that one might draw attention to here, a number fall into well-known categories.¹¹⁹

hand' (1878, 42); also his criticism of 'the substitution of l and ḷ for a final t or ṭ, when these letters *unchanged* precede other consonants, or are final' in the words 'This practice is totally wrong according to all authorities, and probably arises out of the tendency of the people of Malabar to slur over all surd consonants' is in my opinion not really justified.

118 The mistakes discussed all fall into the category of 'mechanical variant.' As far as I can see, there is no *evidence* for 'determined variants,' i.e. deliberate alterations by the scribe of the text he was copying from, in either of the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts discussed here (for the distinction between 'mechanical variants' and 'determined variants' see Greetham 1992, 279–283). This does not mean of course that one can be sure that there are no variants of this type.

119 While the usage of European medieval scribes has been studied intensively and the types of errors which they are prone to commit analysed, similar studies for Sanskrit (and other Indic) manuscripts are rare and, in view especially of the immense quantity and variety of material, inadequate. Of course many classes of mistakes are common to European and Indian scribes, being simply such as any human will inevitably sometimes fall into when copying a text: *bhṛānti*; *puruṣadharmatvāt*. But there are significant differences none the less: in general the Indian situation is much more complex, with large variation in scribal usage according to region and pe-

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). These are difficult to identify with certainty when there is no other manuscript available, but at a few places I have felt confident enough to assume an occurrence and have proposed a correction; cf. e.g. the commentary on 7.2.18 and footnote 41 on p. 130 below.
2. Haplography. A case in which we may conclude with some degree of certainty that this has played a role is the *kṛte kimarthaḥ* transmitted in the *avataṛaṇa* to 7.1.1, surely an error for *kṛteṭi kimarthaḥ* (cf. footnote 8 on p. 101 below). It is to be remembered that Malayalam *ṛ* and *k* are very similar.
3. Dittography. This seems to be occasionally involved, for instance in *ata āha* for *ata āha* in the *avataṛaṇa* to 6.2.14.
4. Misreading of similar *akṣaras*. The cases which can be identified all point to the manuscript having been copied from an exemplar that was also written in Malayalam or a similar Southern script. For instance, there are several cases of confusion of *p* and *v*, such as °*tavanaparispanda*° for °*tapanaparispanda*° in the commentary on 7.2.27.

One might also note the fairly frequent loss of superscript *r* and subscript *y*.

Many errors cannot be explained in one of these ways, and seem rather to involve wrong anticipation of the scribe; i.e. substitution of an expected word even if this bears no palaeographic similarity with what I assume was the original reading; cf. e.g. footnote 40 on p. 112 below. Of course one cannot be sure at what point in the transmission such mistakes arose.

Corrections are rather few; there are no marginal or inter-linear additions. Occasionally *akṣaras* have been cancelled by being struck through or being placed in brackets. I see no signs of a hand other than that of the original scribe having been involved.

1.5.4 Editorial policy

Even with the palm-leaf original at our disposal, to establish a satisfactory text of the commentary is a formidable task—in several cases an impossible one. The manuscript contains a rather large number of scribal errors, and numerous passages are

riod. and with many more varieties of script to be dealt with. The publication of facsimiles and diplomatic transcriptions of Indic manuscripts should be encouraged to facilitate further study of these and other codicological and palaeographical questions.

viciously corrupt. Larger lacunae can of course hardly be restored with anything approaching certainty, unless another manuscript should come to light. The character and style of the text also does not make matters any simpler. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style is often intricate,¹²⁰ his thought, influenced by Udayana, sophisticated and his explanations of sūtras frequently surprising, not to say unnatural. Still, collation of the manuscript revealed that it is possible to improve significantly, in some cases dramatically, on Thakur's edition, by correcting numerous errors which arose, most probably, in the transcript, including several cases where the transcriber inadvertently omitted text owing to eyeskip. In the case of lacunae, access to the surviving fragments of *akṣaras* and the size of the portion which has been destroyed or is illegible.

Methodologically, the editing of this work poses problems of a very particular kind. These are caused first of all by the fact that it is preserved in a *codex unicus*, and secondly by the somewhat curious circumstance that it is most probably an abridgement of a work by one author which was prepared by another.¹²¹ A comparison of the portions which are available in both the long and the abridged version of the commentary immediately shows that it is worse than futile to imagine that the former could ever be restored on the basis of the latter. The most that one can aim for is clearly to correct the text of our sole manuscript in the hope of restoring the form in which it was first written out or dictated by the unknown abridger. But we must allow for the fact that the abridgement was in some cases unsuccessful and therefore that the 'original' which we aim at recovering may well be a flawed one—much more so than in cases where we have only the intentions of a sole author to discover. Inconsistencies, for example, may sometimes have arisen due to a misunderstanding or a slip on the part of the abridger. It is even possible that the abridger made deliberate changes of substance which affect the interpretation given of the sūtras. And of course it is especially to be reckoned with that when omitting sections, large or small, insufficient care on the part of the abridger may have caused an important part of an argument or chain of thought to have been lost, or that the transitions between sentences or segments of text may have become abrupt or awkward.

In dealing with our sole source, we must therefore be aware of the possibility of over-correcting. For this reason a conservative policy is to be preferred, and I have been cautious and sparing in attempts to improve the transmitted text. Even so, cases where the manuscript reading could not be allowed to stand are many, as are those where a lacuna caused by damage to the manuscript must be filled as best we

120 Though at least the abridged version makes for easier reading than the long one.

121 See the discussion on p. 21 ff. above.

can. Opinions will differ on what is tolerable in such a text, and while some may feel readings I have accepted unchanged to be in need of correction, others may perhaps wish to un-do some of my emendations. From the translation and annotation the tentative nature of the established text and the extent to which unsolved problems remain will become plain. Of these problems many may yet, as I hope, be resolved by the ingenuity of others, if not by the discovery of fresh, independent manuscript material.

In emending and restoring the text of the commentary our most valuable resource and safest guide is the corpus of our author's other writings, including of course the surviving part of the full version of the commentary on the VS. These works, which show clear unity of style and thought, allow us to correct and sometimes identify corruptions in our text, both through parallels they provide as to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's language and phrasing and, on occasion, through parallel discussions of a topic dealt with in our work. For the latter, it is the *Tarkasāgara* and the commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī* which, as might be expected, are of frequent help; whereas the *Mahāvīdyāvidambana* is of use chiefly as an instance of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style of writing and of philosophy. Of course it is a fact to be regretted, and one which may to some unforeseeable extent obscure and mislead in the matter of such parallels, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's other works are themselves only available in editions which are less than fully satisfactory. But this is an old story, and something which in the present state of Sanskrit studies may nearly always be automatically assumed—short of re-editing all these works simultaneously, there is little that can be done save to make cautious use of the printed texts and remain alert to the possibility of corruption.

In the case of conjectural restorations of text lost due to damage to the manuscript, I have had the advantage of being able to estimate with some accuracy how many syllables have been lost. From his restorations of the same passages I suspect that Thakur's transcript gave no indications in this regard, for often a conjecture of Thakur must be considered implausible for the simple reason that there would not have been nearly enough space in the manuscript for it. Most probably the transcriber simply indicated all lacunae with a few dots, without troubling to estimate the number of lost *akṣaras*. Of course one cannot be sure that such an estimate is always a trustworthy guide, as it is possible that at just such a place where the manuscript has been damaged the scribe had omitted text, for instance due to eyeskip.

The most strict imperative for the editor is clearly to report the readings of the sole witness as faithfully as possible in all matters of substance. In this regard Thakur's edition is clearly most unsatisfactory; first of all because it is based only on a transcript of the MS, and secondly because even the readings of this transcript are not reported with any degree of care. In the eighty-one pages of text in the *editio prin-*

ceps there is not a single footnote that gives a reading of the transcript. One convention only is used to indicate editorial changes, the placing of square brackets around portions of the text, and exactly what this signifies in each instance is not made clear. The remark in Thakur's English introduction, '[t]he frequent use of brackets both in the sūtras as well as in the commentary will show that we had to take liberty in many cases wherever the manuscript was found defective' (p. 9), shows that they are indicative of editorial intervention, but no distinction is apparently made between corruption, lacunae indicated in the transcript and lacunae not indicated but conjectured. The Sanskrit introduction also mentions these two uses of these brackets, *sūtreṣu vyākhyāyāṃ ca khaṇḍitayojanam apekṣitapūraṇaṃ vā bandhanyā sūcitam* (p. 23). On one sole occasion is the meaning of the brackets made explicit: on p. 16, where two sūtras (numbered 1.2.12–13) are placed in their entirety within brackets there is a note which tells us that *bandhanīsthitam sūtradvayaṃ mātṛkāyām anulikhitam api vyākhyayā apekṣitam*; this is thus a case where we are clearly informed that the transcript indicated no lacuna but one was suspected by Thakur. Elsewhere, however, the brackets are placed around syllables or words which are lost due to damage in the manuscript, and of which we may undoubtedly suppose that their loss was indicated in Thakur's transcript; in other cases yet, they seem to indicate syllables which have been altered by the editor, while to judge from the evidence of the manuscript, a great part of the editorial emendations is not indicated at all. Of course, without access to the transcript, it is never quite certain whether a divergence between the manuscript and the text of Thakur's edition originates from the transcriber or from Thakur.

1.5.5 The *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra

While apart from Thakur's pioneering editions little work has been done on the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, the *sūtrapāṭha* followed therein has attracted some attention. In its own right, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is of course of interest and importance, but in view of the difficulties surrounding the VS, it is perhaps natural that many scholars should find the importance of the work to lie more in its testimony to the sūtra-text than in the commentary itself, which so clearly breathes the spirit of a later period.

On the problem of determining the text of the sūtras as known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, Thakur makes the following remarks.

The commentary gives the sūtra-text also. But the manuscript does not distinguish the sūtras from the commentary. The commentary in its turn, generally does not give any introduction to, or a word

for word explanation of, the sūtras. Hence it was sometimes found very difficult to ascertain the sūtrapāṭha followed. The lacunae were also formidable hurdles. It is at times felt that some sūtras have been covered by them in the manuscript. Moreover, some sūtras have only been referred to while many others are found untouched. The Sūtrapāṭha in the present edition *should not be regarded as the exact version followed by our commentator* [my emphasis]. Thus we have not changed abhāvas tamaḥ into bhā 'bhāvas tamaḥ in V. ii. 19 *though the commentary suggests it* [my emphasis]. The frequent use of brackets both in the sūtras as well as in the commentary will show that we had to take liberty in many cases wherever the manuscript was found defective. Sometimes we thought ourselves fortunate as the word or words lost in the sūtra-text were suggested by the commentary. In others, we had to follow Śaṅkara Miśra for want of a better authority. But no sūtra has been accepted here the existence of which was not somehow suggested either by the commentary or by direct mention in the manuscript.¹²² (p. 9)

These remarks give a good indication of the difficulty of reconstructing the sūtrapāṭha, but are less than perfectly clear as to Thakur's precise policy (cf. especially the emphasized portions of the quotation). The confession that in some cases Śaṅkara Miśra's reading has been followed 'for want of a better authority' leads one to expect that with the help of Candrānanda's sūtrapāṭha (and commentary), which was published in 1961, four years after the appearance of Thakur's edition,¹²³ some improvement would prove possible. Indeed, a big step in this direction was made by Jambūvijaya in the second appendix of his invaluable edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, which gives a comparative table of the sūtras as found in the two commentaries. Jambūvijaya was not content to print Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's sūtrapāṭha in the form given by Thakur, but in a praiseworthy fashion reconsidered the entire text in the light of the commentary and, especially, the new evidence provided by Candrānanda. In the introductory section of this

122 There is no corresponding passage in Thakur's Sanskrit introduction.

123 Thakur was aware of the fact that Jambūvijaya was preparing an edition of Candrānanda's commentary, for on p. 20 of his English introduction he writes that '[w]e are glad to note that under the auspices of the Oriental Institute, Baroda, Jaina Muni Śrī Jambūvijaya has undertaken an edition of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras along with the hitherto unpublished commentary of Candrānanda. We hope that this commentary will throw much welcome light on the problems of the Vaiśeṣika system.' Later Thakur contributed an English introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. At the time of his own work on the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary, however, he clearly did not have access to Candrānanda's commentary, either in the form of manuscripts or proofs of Jambūvijaya's edition.

appendix, after explaining the difficulty of determining the form of the VS known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, Jambūvijaya writes that, although he has followed Thakur in most places, there were also cases where they do not agree, and that the *sūtrapāṭha* and numbering given are his own reconstruction.¹²⁴

Unlike Thakur, it seems therefore that Jambūvijaya has adopted the support of the commentary as his most important criterium in establishing the text of the sūtras: a procedure which appears to me wholly justified. He identified many sūtras which Thakur had mistaken for sentences of the commentary and made corrections to numerous others. His contribution is an important one, and only in a few places do I find it difficult to follow the reasoning behind his proposals.¹²⁵

The next scholar who concerned himself with the problem of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭhaḥ*, M. Nozawa, describes the situation and his own position as follows.

The sūtras of V. are not distinguished from the commentary in the manuscript. In the text, they are separated from the commentary and printed in large type. The editor says that the *sūtrapāṭha* in the edition should not be regarded as the exact version followed by the commentator, because he had to follow U. [i.e. the sūtra text attested to by Śaṅkara Miśra's commentary, the *Vaiśeṣikasūtrapaskāra*] for want of a better authority (Intr. p. 9). (C. [i.e. Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary] had not been published then.) Four years later C., edited by Muni Śrī Jambuvijayaji [sic], was published. The *Dvitiyaṃ Pariṣiṣṭam* of this book (pp. 101ff.) gives the comparative table of the sūtras between C. and V. In its foreword the

124 To quote Jambūvijaya's remarks in full: *kiñ ca, mātṛkāyāṃ sūtrapāṭhaḥ pṛthag naivāsti. vṛttir eva vidyate, tatra ca bahutarāḥ sūtrapāṭhaḥ mātṛkāyāṃ vṛtyā miśṛita eva varīate. ataḥ sampādakena yaḥ sūtrapāṭhaḥ sambhāvitāḥ prāyaḥ sa eva bahuṣu sthaleṣu atṛasmābhir upadarśitāḥ, kin tu santi kāñicīti sthālāni yatra sūtrapāṭhanirṇaye 'smākaṃ vīmatīḥ* (here Jambūvijaya adds a footnote in which he quotes the same passage from Thakur's introduction to his edition on the difficulty of determining the *sūtrapāṭhaḥ* which was quoted on p. 48 above) | *yato mi.vṛttau yady api bahutarāḥ sūtrapāṭho miśṛito varīate tathāpi kāñicīti sūtrāṇi mātṛkāyāṃ parigalīṭāni, katipayāni mi.vṛttāṃ avyākhyātāni, keṣāñcīti ca sūtrāṇāṃ mi.vṛttau kevalā vyākhyāya vidyate, kāñicīti ca sūtrāṇi vyākhyāsaṅkaryārthaṃ kvacit kvacīd itas tataḥ śabdakramaparivartanaṃ vidhūya kāñścīti ca śabdān pūrayitvā mi. vṛttāṃ upanyasiātāni* | *tasmā: sampūrṇaḥ sūtrapāṭho mi. vṛtṭyanusāreṇa yathāvan nirṇetum na śakyate* | *atas tādṛśeṣu sthaleṣu mi. pustake 'mudrito 'pi sūtrapāṭho yathāsmābhiḥ sambhāvitāḥ tathaivātra mi.vṛttikṛdabhimatayā sambhāvite sūtrapāṭhe 'smābhir upanyastāḥ sūtrāṅkāś ca parivartitā itī dhyeyam* | (p. 101; Jambūvijaya's emphasis). The designation *mi. vṛttī*, i.e. 'Mithilā commentary,' by which Jambūvijaya refers to our text does not intend to imply that the commentary was a product of the Mithilā school of Nyāya(-Vaiśeṣika), but merely alludes to the fact that Thakur's edition was published in that province, and as a volume of the *Mithilāvidyāpīṭhagranthamālā*.

125 For instance with regard to 7.1.4 (not recognized as a sūtra by Thakur): see the annotation to the translation below.

editor says that some sūtras of V. in this table (abr. M.) are determined according to his own supposition. And we find corrections in more than fifty sūtras. But among these some are inconsistent with the explanations of V. and others are merely assimilated with the sūtras of C.; therefore M. can not be regarded as the exact version, either. The sūtrapāṭha of V. is still under necessity of inspection.

The following corrections are made in this principle that, finding passages identical with or resembling the sūtras of C. and being able to regard them as sūtras contextually, we correct the text within the limits of alternation of partition of the sentences, and do not change the words of the word order excepting those of the lacunal parts which are put in brackets in the text. (Nozawa 1974, 473(25))

Nozawa is thus commendably explicit as to the principles followed in his determination of the sūtrapāṭha. However his results are somewhat disappointing. In a few instances he does indeed improve on Jambūvijaya's text, but in many others his rejection of Jambūvijaya's proposals is unjustified and has proved mistaken (cf. below). The sūtrapāṭha which he proposes can be found in its entirety in Nozawa 1985: I have not noticed any divergencies in this later article from his suggestions of 1974.

By and large, then, Jambūvijaya has presented the most plausible reconstruction of the sūtrapāṭha followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra. As was to be expected, however, access to the manuscript itself allows further progress to be made.¹²⁶ For one thing, the small dots which are the only mark of punctuation employed (see p. 44 above) clearly serve to mark sūtras, and provide aid which, had Thakur been able to make use of it, would have prevented numerous errors with regard to the identification of sūtras. At the same time it must however be remembered that the use of these dots is neither completely consistent nor without errors—if we assume that the marking off of sūtras was their sole purpose.

More importantly, there are cases where entire sūtras have been omitted in Thakur's edition due to (usually haplographical) loss of text in his transcript. As examples may serve 6.1.12, 6.2.6, 7.1.19 and 7.2.4. It may be of interest to note that with the exception of the case of 6.2.6 Jambūvijaya had already conjectured that these sūtras should be incorporated into Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's sūtrapāṭha, and at the right places, whereas Nozawa conjectured a reading of 7.1.19 (7.1.13 as numbered by Thakur and Nozawa) which hardly makes sense and rejected Jambūvijaya's conjecture at 6.1.12 and 7.2.4. This speaks eloquently for Jambūvijaya's

126 For the sūtrapāṭha of the first two *adhyāyas*, the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary now is of course an important witness.

acute philological sense and the attention with which he read the text. Finally, there are of course several cases where Thakur's text is based on a misreading; again this was sometimes correctly recognized by Jambūvijaya, as at 7.2.10, where Jambūvijaya's conjecture, confirmed by the manuscript despite damage, was again rejected by Nozawa.

In dealing with the text of the sūtras, a slightly different approach from that followed with respect to the commentary may be legitimate. Here I believe there is less reason to be wary of the possibility of over-correction. In cases, for instance, where a sūtra is omitted entirely in the manuscript, the decision to include it conjecturally in the text in some form has not been influenced by the possibility that the abridger had already omitted it from his text,¹²⁷ but is made on the basis of the degree of likelihood that it formed part of the *sūtrapāṭha* as known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. Besides, for the reading of the sūtras we have additional material in the form of no less than four other recensions of the complete text,¹²⁸ an incomplete recension of *adhyāyas* 9 and 10¹²⁹ and numerous quotations and parallels. I see no reason why this material should not be taken into account, though it cannot of course be binding; thus in a case where the manuscript diverges against the unanimous testimony of our other sources and the commentary does not allow to determine the precise form which it presupposes, an emendation of the transmitted text should at least be seriously considered.

1.5.6 Conventions of the text and apparatus

As remarked above, in view of the scanty material on which this edition is based, in all cases where it has been found necessary to depart from the text of the manuscript, accurate presentation of its readings is of great importance. For this reason I have chosen to print the text in Roman transliteration, which frequently allows greater precision when reporting doubtful and damaged readings, and has the added advantage that most word-divisions are made explicit. I have not chosen to use a convention to indicate that two words have coalesced in *svarasandhi*, but I trust that with the aid of the translation doubtful cases, should there be any, will be clear. Punctuation, consisting of commas, long dashes and *daṇḍas*, has been added and

¹²⁷ Such an omission on the part of the abridger, if it indeed occurred, would I presume be due to oversight rather than a deliberate desire to abridge the sūtras as well as the commentary.

¹²⁸ Namely the version commented on by Candrānanda, the version commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra, the recension represented by the Ahmedabad manuscript and the recension represented by the Trivandrum manuscript. For some remarks on the first of these, together with a partial re-edition, see Part 2 of this thesis; the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts are treated in Part 3.

¹²⁹ Cf. the second appendix of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*, Thakur 1965 and p. 12 above.

is always editorial. The dots which serve for punctuation marks in the manuscript have been reproduced; they have, as we remarked above, some value as a help in identifying sūtras, and to report them in the apparatus instead would have caused a not inconsiderable increase in size. It is hoped that they will not prove disturbing. The application of sandhi has been normalized, i.e. rules of external sandhi have been consistently applied except when a punctuation mark separates two words. The sūtras have been set apart and indented, and numbers have been added.¹³⁰

Various kinds of brackets have been used in the text and apparatus, chiefly to indicate editorial interventions.

- () Indicate that a reading is probable but uncertain; this has reference to the condition of the manuscript and the clarity of the *akṣaras*, not to the wording of the text.
- < > Enclose syllables (or parts of syllables) which have been supplied to fill up lacunae due to damage of the manuscript.
- ⌈ ⌋ Enclose syllables or parts of syllables which have been added where the manuscript is not damaged, i.e. where I assume that they have been omitted due to (scribal) error.
- [] Enclose editorial additions which do not form a part of the text—folio indications and references to other sūtras.

No attempt has been made to mark passages whereof the wording is uncertain; uncertainties abound in this text, and I hope to have pointed out and discussed all the major ones in the notes to the translation.

The apparatus aims at reporting all variants of substance in both the manuscript and the *editio princeps*. By variants of substance I mean here differences which change or obscure the sense. This excludes variants of orthography, sandhi and punctuation which a reader accustomed to the orthography and habits of scribes would not interpret as actual differences in wording. To be more precise, the following types of variation have not been treated as variants of substance.

1. Gemination of consonants after or before a semi-vowel, most frequently *r*.
Examples: *dharmah* / *dharmmah*, *kāryam* / *kāryyam*.¹³¹

130 For a concordance of the numbering in Thakur's edition, this edition and the numberings of Jambūvijaya and Nozawa, as well as other recensions of the VS, see Appendix 1.

131 Aspirates being geminated by the placing of the corresponding non-aspirate before them (cf. Wackemagel I §96), orthographies such as *rīth* for *rih* and *rdāhv* for *rdhv*, which we usually find in the manuscript, also fall under this heading.

2. Reduction of a double consonant to a single one before a semi-vowel. Example: *tattvam / tatvam*.
3. Use of *anusvāra* for homorganic nasal or vice-versa. Examples: *aṅgaḥ / aṁgaḥ*, *kiṁ tu / kin tu*. It may be remarked that in the manuscript *m* and the *halanta* form of *m* are not always clearly distinguishable.
4. Use of class-sibilant for *visarga* before a sibilant. Example: *prathamāḥ śabdaḥ / prathamaś śabdaḥ*.
5. Non-application of sandhi.

The apparatus is a positive one; this means that each entry begins with a lemma which repeats the relevant portion of text exactly as it was given in the body of the edition, followed by a : to mark the end of the lemma. After this the source of the reading is given, followed by a comma and then the actual variants. The following sigla and abbreviations are used.

MS The reading found in the manuscript.

MS^{pc} The reading of the manuscript after (scribal) correction (*post correctionem*).

MS^{ac} The reading of the manuscript before (scribal) correction (*ante correctionem*).

em. An emendation. If the emendation is already found in Thakur's edition, I add 'with Thakur,' and if he has no indication that it is an emendation (i.e. if there are no brackets in his text) I further add '(silently).'

conj. A conjecture. If the conjecture is already found in Thakur's edition, I add 'with Thakur,' and if he has no indication that it is a conjecture (i.e. if there are no brackets in his text) I further add '(silently).'

The difference between an 'emendation' and a 'conjecture' is a frankly subjective one. Use of the former term indicates a greater confidence in the correctness of the change proposed. Despite this subjective nature, it seemed useful to introduce such a distinction; there is after all a considerable difference between e.g. changing *niṣkrayaḥ śabdaḥ* to *niṣkriyaḥ śabdaḥ* and conjecturally filling up a lacuna of eight or nine *akṣaras*.

In cases where we have a lacuna in the manuscript, usually caused by crumbling of the margins, I add an estimate of the number of *akṣaras* which might have been written. It is to be remembered in considering these places, some of which

may be called cruxes, that these approximations are very rough, and become more unreliable in proportion to the size of the lacuna. The amount of space taken up by an *akṣara* varies considerably, especially since *akṣaras* with *prṣṭhamātra e, ai* or *o* require considerably more space.

1.5.7 The translation and notes

With a work such as this, not infrequently difficult to follow, and beset with textual problems, it seemed imperative to add to the edition a translation and annotation. Both have limited aims, but taken together it is hoped that they form a moderately detailed, though not exhaustive, commentary on the text of the edition. The translation is intended as a check on the edition, making clear how I have interpreted the text I have restored, and is not one which can easily be read on its own, without reference to the Sanskrit. It is not completely literal—no translation is—but sufficiently so that it should be plain how I construe the Sanskrit.

The translation of the *sūtras* is in accordance with the interpretations given by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, as far as these can be determined. Words which the commentary suggest should be supplied are added within square brackets, except in some cases where the need for this is removed by the commentary itself explicitly stating that certain words are to be added to the *sūtra*.

Since I expect that no-one will read the translation who is not able to turn to the Sanskrit, I have not made any particular effort to find the happiest translations for various technical terms and *śāstric* turns of phrase, but have most frequently stuck with equivalents which are in fairly common use. For the same reason, some Sanskrit words have been left untranslated. Whether it is possible and desirable to translate a text of this nature in such a way that philosophers with no Sanskrit can read and comprehend it is in any case, in my view, a doubtful question. Even if it is, I fear that I am not competent for such a task.

The annotation to the translation deals mainly with two types of difficulty: textual and exegetical.¹³² I have tried to explain and justify important and difficult decisions taken in the editorial process and to draw attention to alternative possibilities and unsolved problems. All cases where I have differed in matters of substance from Thakur have been discussed. The notes on interpretation contain chiefly comparative material and discussion pertaining to historical and philosophical questions; it is to be feared that these will be found even less complete than the former type of annotation. In general, I have striven to give such commentary as is most likely to be needed, rather than attempting to be exhaustive, and the number

132 The boundary between these two areas is of course often vague.

of parallel passages given has been deliberately kept down. Nonetheless, like most commentators, I have sometimes not been able to resist the temptation to digress. In some cases a remark has been made as to the relative merits of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's and Candrānanda's reading of a sūtra or their interpretation, and Śaṅkara Mīśra's commentary has also been referred to now and then, but no attempt has been made to be thorough in this regard. Such matters belong to an investigation into the original form and meaning of the VS and the historical development thereof rather than to a study such as this, which aims primarily at making available the material on which such 'higher' studies can be based.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Though the need for a new edition of this text will be plain to anyone who has worked with Thakur's edition, such an undertaking would have been utterly futile without access to the *codex unicus*. My work would therefore never have been begun but for Prof. A. Wezler and Prof. K. V. Sharma, who gave initial advice and help in my attempts to locate the manuscript, and, most of all, Mr. P. L. Shahji, who finally uncovered it and made photographs available to me. In Hamburg, during the summer semester of 1994, I had the opportunity to read through a preliminary draft of my edition of some portions of the text together with Mr. C. Nenninger, Dr. K. Preisendanz and Prof. A. Wezler. For this not only I but the readers of this edition must be thankful, for had it not been for the help of these scholars the text would have resisted my attempts at understanding and correction in many more places. I cannot fail also to acknowledge that I have benefited from comments made by Prof. T. Vetter, Dr. H. T. Bakker and Mr. Jürgen Hanneded. On several earlier occasions, before the manuscript itself was available to me, Prof. Wezler gave generously of his time to read parts of the commentary in Thakur's edition with me: this too has helped me greatly in recognizing and dealing with difficulties. Last but not least, I take pleasure in acknowledging my indebtedness to Anantalal Thakur: had he not first edited the text it might have remained forgotten till this day. I have benefited much from his work, and have adopted many emendations and conjectures which stem from him. In presenting this edition I can do no better than to repeat his words: *atra truṭibāhulyam asmān sthagayati sma viṣayagauravaṇi ca prakāśanavidhau prerayati smety ubhayata ākrṣyamāṇair asmābhiḥ prakāśanam evorartkṛtam*.¹³³

133 From p. 23 of Thakur's Sanskrit introduction.

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1

[f. 137^{v.5}] karmaparīkṣānantaram guṇaparīkṣā kariṣyate | guṇebhyo 'bhyarhitatvād
adṛṣṭaparīkṣārtham ṣaṣṭhādhyāyārambhah¹ | tatra dharmādharmasādhaneṣu vedāḥ
pramāṇam, tatprāmāṇyam² īśvarapraṇītateneti tadvyutpādanārtham³ sūtram—

· buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vede⁴ · || 6.1.1

vākyakṛtir vākyaracanākrama iti yāvat | buddhipūrvā puruṣabuddhijanyā | veda-
vākyakramah puruṣabuddhijanyaḥ, vākyakramatvāt, kālidāsavākyakramavat⁵

||
asmadādibhir a... tāparihārārtham⁶ sūtram—

na cāsmadbuddhibhyo⁷ līṅgam ṛṣeḥ || 6.1.2

asmadādibuddhi⁸vākyajanakatvasya bādhitatvāt tadatiriktapuruṣabuddhau vedavā-
kyam (līṅgam | sa ca)⁹ bhagavān ṛṣir īśvaraḥ ||

· brāhmaṇasaṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam · || 6.1.3

asti tāvat sargādāv utpanneṣu brāhmaṇādiṣu brāhmaṇādipadasaṃketakaraṇa(m |
na cāsmadādīnām)¹⁰ [f. 138^r] sargādaḥ brāhmaṇatvādiṣūjanām, indriyasannipā-
tamātreṇa kṣatriyādivyāvṛttabrāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt,¹¹ vyañjakāntarābhāvāc
ca | na tāvad atra saṃsthānaviśeṣo vyañja(kaḥ, kṣatri)yādi¹²vyāvṛttasaṃsthānavi-
śeṣasya yogyā¹³nupalambhanirastatvāt | nāpi brāhmaṇabhūtamātāpitṛ¹⁴janyatvam,

1 ṣaṣṭhādhyāyārambhah: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, ṣaṣṭhyāddhyāyārambhah MS

2 tatprāmāṇyam: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, tatprāmāṇyam MS

3 tadvyutpādanārtham: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, tadyutpādanārtham MS

4 vede: *conj.*, vedāḥ MS Thakur

5 kālidāsavākyakramavat: MS, kālidāsādivākyakramavat Thakur

6 asmadādibhir a... tāparihārārtham: (*space for up to 4 akṣaras, the first of which was probably ka. ta. or a ligature with k or t; rtha also possible*) MS, asmadādi[bhir ākalito 'yam krama ity āśaṅkā]parihārārtham Thakur

7 na cāsmadbuddhibhyo: *conj.*, sa vāsmadbuddhibhyo MS, sa vā asmadbu[ddhanyo] Thakur

8 asmadādibuddhi: MS, asmadādibuddher Thakur

9 vedavākyam (līṅgam | sa ca): *conj.*, vedavākyam... (*space for up to 5 akṣaras, the first of which had medial i*) MS, vedavākya[janakatvam iti vedakartā] Thakur

10 °saṃketakaraṇa(m | na cāsmadādīnām): *conj.*, °saṃketakaraṇa... (*space for up to 7 akṣaras*) MS, °saṃketakaro °smadādivilakṣaṇaḥ yasya Thakur

11 °brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt: MS, °brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt Thakur

12 vyañja(kaḥ, kṣatri)yādi: *em.*, vyañja...yādi° (*space for up to 4 akṣaras, the first of which was probably ka*) MS, vyañja[ko brāhmaṇatvādeḥ kṣatri]yādi° Thakur

13 °viśeṣasya yogyā: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °viśeṣasyayogyā° MS

14 °mātāpitṛ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °mātrāpitṛ° MS

sargādyeṣu tadasambhavāt | nāpy adṛṣṭaviśeṣākṛṣṭabhūtajanyatvam. adṛṣṭānava-
game tasyāpy anavagamāt | tasmād asti kaścīd bhagavān asmadādyatīndriya-
brāhmaṇatvādisākṣātkārabhāk¹⁵ saṃketagrāh[ay]itā,¹⁶ santi ca kecit tatprasā-
dāsāditāsmadādyatīndriya¹⁷brāhmaṇatvādisākṣātkārabhājāḥ saṃketagrahītāra
iti ||

siddhe vedaprāmāṇye tat[prati]pādyā¹⁸dharmasāadhanapratipādanārtham upa-
kramate—

· buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ || 6.1.4

lakṣaṇayā dhātvarthe dadātiprayogaḥ | buddhir āstikyabuddhiḥ | śraddhāpūrvakam
dānam¹⁹ dharmasāadhanam ity arthaḥ | dānam kaṃcid uddiśya tyāgaḥ | na ca yāga-
homayor avyāptiḥ,²⁰ tayor²¹ api dānaviśeṣatvāt | cetanam uddiśya dravyatyāgo²²
dānam | na yāghomayor ativyāptiḥ,²¹ devatāyā acetanatvād iti jaiminiprabhṛta-
yaḥ | tad ayuktam, devatāyāś cetanatvāt ||

· tathā pratigrahaḥ || 6.1.5

śraddhāpūrvakaḥ²³ pratigraho 'pi dharmasāadhanam ||

tayoś ca kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām · || 6.1.6

tayor dānapratigrahayoḥ kramah kāryakāraṇabhāvarahitānām api rāsabhaghaṭādī-
nām iva ||

· ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt · || 6.1.7

ātmāntaraguṇānām īśvaravyatiriktātmāntaraguṇānām | devadattaniṣṭhadāna-
dharmo²⁴ na yajñadattaniṣṭhapratigrahadharmakāraṇam, devadattadharmaatvāt.
sampratipannavat | ato dānapra[f. 138v]tigrayahoyō kāryakāraṇabhāve pramāṇā-
bhāvavad²⁵ bādhakam apy astīty uktam ||

katham tarhi yajñadattaputraniṣṭhaśrāddhadharmeṇa yajñadattaniṣṭhaprītijana-
nam | ata āha—

15 °bhāk: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °bhājas MS

16 °grāh[ay]itā: *em.*, °grāhītā MS, °grahītā Thakur

17 °sāditāsmadādyatīndriya°: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °sāditāsmadādyatīndriya° MS

18 tat[prati]pādyā°: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °tatpādyā° MS

19 °pūrvakam dānam: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °pūrvakandāna MS

20 avyāptiḥ: *conj.*, ativyāptiḥ MS Thakur

21 tayor... ativyāptiḥ: MS, *om.* Thakur(eyeskip)

22 dravyatyāgo: *em.*, ddravyatyāgo MS

23 °pūrvakaḥ: MS. °pūrvaka° Thakur

24 °dānadharmo: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °dānadharmā MS

25 pramāṇābhāvavad: *em.*, pramāṇābhāvavat MS. pramāṇābhāvāt Thakur

· aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyaḥārato 'bhyudayaḥ || 6.1.8

aduṣṭabrāhmaṇabhojanāt tṛptāduṣṭabrāhmaṇodīritāt pitaras²⁶ te sukhino bhūyāsur²⁷ ity āśīrvādāt sukhodayaḥ ||

· [[tad]]²⁸ duṣṭabhojane na vidyate || 6.1.9

tad abhyudayakāraṇaṃ duṣṭabhojane na bhavati ||

· duṣṭaṃ himsāyām || 6.1.10

pravṛttaṃ viddhīti²⁹ śeṣaḥ | himsāyām ity upalakṣaṇaṃ suvarṇasteyādīnām | duṣṭabhojane doṣa eva, nābhyudayo jāyate ||

· tad aduṣṭe na vidyate || 6.1.11

viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ³⁰ || 6.1.12

svato 'dhikaguṇavati dānārthaṃ pravṛttiḥ kāryā ||

· tathā viruddhānām tyāgaḥ || 6.1.13

yathā dānādayas tathā viruddhānām ātatāyinām ca tyāgo vadho 'pi dharmasādhanaṃ ||

· sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā || 6.1.14

viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ || 6.1.15

utkr̥ṣṭātātāyivadho na kartavya eveti ||

iti ṣaṣṭhasya prathamam āhnikam³¹

26 *brāhmaṇodīritāt pitaras: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °brāhmaṇād īritāt pataras MS

27 bhūyāsur: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, bhūyāṇur MS

28 [[tad]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, *om.* MS

29 viddhīti: *em. with Thakur (silently)* (viddhi iti), viddhiti MS

30 viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ: MS, *om.* Thakur

31 iti ṣaṣṭhasya prathamam āhnikam: MS (*with stylized śrī before and after the colophon*), iti śrī-madvaiśeṣike darśane ṣaṣṭhādhyāyasya prathamāhnikam Thakur

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 2

dr̥ṣṭānām dr̥ṣṭaprayojanānām dr̥ṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya | 6.2.1

vedena¹ bodhyata iti śeṣaḥ | dr̥ṣṭaprayojanānām ity atrābhāvād iti śeṣaḥ | dr̥ṣṭābhāva
ity atra svargādyutpatter iti śeṣaḥ | prayogo² brāhmaṇādyuddeśena³ tyāgaḥ |
tathā⁴ ca dr̥ṣṭānām hiraṇyasamidājyacarupuroḍāśādīnām brāhmaṇādyuddeśena⁴
tyāgaḥ svargasādhanadharmaśādhanaṭay(ā)⁵ <vede>na⁶ bodhyata iti ||

· abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasth[īy]a⁷ yajña-
dānaprokṣaṇa⁸ diṇnakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādr̥ṣṭāya || 6.2.2

<niyama iti pra>[f. 139r]tyekam⁹ abhisambadhyate | abhiṣecananiyamah. upavāsa-
niyamah, brahmacaryaniyama¹⁰ ityādi | prātar eva snātavyam ity abhiṣecana-
niya(mah, ekādaśyām u)poṣitavyam ity¹¹ upavāsaniyama ityādi | gurur īśvaraḥ
sarveṣāṃ dharmopadeṣṭā | vanād vanam pratiṣṭhata iti vānaprasthaḥ | na¹² tu
tṛtīyāśramī | tasya karma vānaprasthyam¹³ ||

· cāturāśramya(m || 6.2.3

adr̥ṣṭā)yety¹⁴ anuvartate ||

· upadhānupadhāś ca¹⁵ . || 6.2.4 ||

adr̥ṣṭāyety anuṣaṅgaḥ | upadhādharmasāadhanam, anupadhā dharmasāadhanam ||

· bhāvadoṣa upadhā- || 6.2.5

- 1 vedena: MS^p Thakur, vedana MS^{ac}
- 2 prayogo: MS, [evaṃ sati] go^o Thakur
- 3 brāhmaṇādyuddeśena: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), brāhmaṇādyundeśana MS
- 4 tathā... brāhmaṇādyuddeśena: MS. *om.* Thakur(eyeskip)
- 5 °dharmaśādhanaṭay(ā): MS, °dharmaśādhanaṃ Thakur
- 6 <vede>na: *em.* ... na (*space for 2 akṣaras*) MS, [vedapramāṇe]na Thakur
- 7 °prasth[īy]a^o: *em.* °prastha^o MS Thakur
- 8 °prokṣaṇa^o: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), °prokṣaṇan MS
- 9 <niyama iti pra>tyekam: *em. with* Thakur ([niyama iti] pratyekam), ... tyekam *space for up to 6 akṣaras, the first of which had medial i* MS
- 10 brahmacaryaniyama: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), brahmacaryanayami MS
- 11 °niya(mah | ekādaśyām u)poṣitavyam ity: *conj. with* Thakur (°niyamah | [ekādaśyām u]poṣitavyam ity), °niya... poṣitavyam ety (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS
- 12 na: MS, sa Thakur
- 13 vānaprasthyam: *em.*, vānaspatyam MS, vānaprastham Thakur
- 14 cāturāśramya(m || adr̥ṣṭā)yety: *em.*, *with* Thakur, cāturāśramya... yety (*space for up to 3 akṣaras, the last of which had medial ā or o*) MS
- 15 upadhānupadhāś ca: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), upadhānupadhāyāś ca MS

bhāvo 'bhisam̐dhiḥ¹⁶ | tena duṣṭo 'bhisam̐dhir upadheti lakṣaṇam ||

· adoṣo¹⁷ 'nupadhā· || 6.2.6

aduṣṭo 'bhisam̐dhi[[r a]]nupadheti¹⁸ lakṣaṇam ||

· iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam¹⁹ prokṣitam abhyukṣitam ca²⁰ tac
chuci· || 6.2.7

iṣṭā rūparasagandhasparśā yatra [[ta]]d iṣṭarūpa[[rasagandhasparśa]]m²¹ | prokṣitam
samanrodakasiktam | abhyukṣitam ca | tad iti buddhisthānnādeḥ parāmarśaḥ | tādr-
śam annādi dharmasādhana²² ity arthaḥ ||

aśuci²³ śucipratīṣedhaḥ || 6.2.8

arthāntaram ca || 6.2.9

caṇḍālādisprṣtam²⁴ aśucīti dvitīyasūtrārthaḥ ||

· ayatasya²⁵ śucibhojanād abhyudayo²⁶ na vidyate || 6.2.10

ayato²⁷ yamarahitaḥ ||

asati cābhāvāt²⁸ · || 6.2.11

asati śucibhojane yamād viśiṣṭadharmānudayād ubhayor viśiṣṭadharṁe kāraṇa-
tvam ||

· sukhād rāgaḥ· || 6.2.12

anubhūyamānaṁ sukhaṁ tajjātīyasukhāntare rāgaṁ janayati | so 'pi tatsādhane, yo
yat kāmaya[[te]]²⁹ sa tatsādhanam api kāmaya ity sthiteḥ ||

16 'bhisam̐dhiḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), pi sandhiḥ MS

17 adoṣo... lakṣaṇam (*in commentary on 6.2.6*): MS, *om.* Thakur

18 'bhisam̐dhir anupadheti: *em.*, bhisandhinupadheti MS

19 iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam: MS, [yad] iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam Thakur

20 abhyukṣitam ca: MS^{pc} (°ñ ca) Thakur, abhyukṣitīñ ca MS^{ac}

21 [[ta]]d iṣṭarūpa[[rasagandhasparśa]]m: *em. with* Thakur, draṣṭarūpaṁ MS

22 annādi dharmasādhanaṁ: *conj.*, annābhi(dha)masādhanaṁ MS, annam api dharmasādhanaṁ Thakur

23 aśuci MS, aśuci [iti] Thakur

24 caṇḍālādisprṣtam: MS, caṇḍālādisprṣtam Thakur

25 ayatasya: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ayātasya MS

26 abhyudayo: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), abhyudayā MS

27 ayato: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ayāto MS

28 cābhāvāt: MS^{pc} Thakur, (bha)cābhāvāt MS

29 kāmaya[[te]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), kāmaya MS

· na tr̥pteḥ || 6.2.13

pratibandhakatvād iti śeṣaḥ | bhojanasukhānubhavo na punarbhojane pravṛtitiṃ janayati, pratibandhābhāvaviśiṣṭasya tasya pravṛtījanakatvāt! sukhānubhavasya rāgakāraṇa[f. 139v]tve jātāmātrasya stanapānādaḥ rāgo na syāt, tasya sukhānubhāvābhāvāt ||
ata āha³⁰—

· adṛṣṭāc ca || 6.2.14

jātāmātrasya jantoḥ pūrvajanmānubhūtasukhasmarāṇaṃ saṃskārādṛṣṭābhyāṃ jātām³¹ rāgakāraṇam ||

etena dveṣo vyākhyātaḥ || 6.2.15

nigadavyākhyātam etat ||

yady adṛṣṭād rāgadveṣau katham tarhi manuṣyasyānnādaḥ rāgaḥ, aśvādeś ca tr̥ṇādāv iti rāgaviśeṣaḥ³² | ata āha—

· jātiviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ || 6.2.16

cakārāj jātiviśeṣād dveṣaviśeṣaḥ | anvayavyatirekābhyāṃ jātiviśeṣa(s)yaṇi taddhetutvāvadhāraṇāt ||

[[icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛtīḥ]]³³ || 6.2.17

tataḥ saṃyogaḥ || 6.2.18

rāgadveṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām³⁴ apūrvāśarīrādibandhaḥ ||

· vibhāgaś ca || 6.2.19

dharmādharmakṣayād iti śeṣaḥ ||

yadi rāgādibhyo dharmādharmau tarhi tadutpādanānuparamān na kadācin mokṣa[[ḥ]]³⁵ syāt | ata āha—

· ātmakarmasu³⁶ mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ || 6.2.20

30 āha: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, āta āha MS

31 jātām: *em., jāta°* MS Thakur

32 tr̥ṇādāv iti rāgaviśeṣaḥ: *em., tr̥ṇādāv iti yāgaviśeṣo (sandhi before the following a)* MS, tr̥ṇādau rāgaviśeṣaḥ Thakur

33 [[icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛtīḥ]]: *em., om.* MS Thakur

34 rāgadveṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām: *conj., rāgaviśeṣaprayuktadharmādharmābhyām* MS Thakur

35 mokṣa[[ḥ]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, mokṣa MS

36 ātmakarmasu: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, ātmakarmasu MS

ātmā prāṇaḥ | tatkarṃasu nirūpyamāṇeṣu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ, tadabhāve saṃyogā-
bhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣa iti [cf. 5.2.18] sūtreṇa | sakalātmaviśeṣaḥ sa-
cchedaś ca mokṣa(ḥ | sukhā)bhāvād³⁷ apumarthatvam apīti samavyayaphalatvam³⁸
iti cet—na, sukhāpekṣayā duḥkhasya prācuryeṇa tadabhāvāt pumarthatvopapa-
tteḥ ||

iti śaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ³⁹

37 mokṣa(ḥ | sukhā)bhāvād: *conj.*. mokṣa...bhāvād (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS, mokṣaḥ
tatreṣṭasyāpy abhāvād Thakur

38 samavyayaphalatvam: MS, sama[māya]vyayaphalatvam Thakur

39 iti śaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ: MS (*with stylized śrī before and probably after, though the latter damaged*),
iti śrīmadvaiśeṣikadarśane śaṣṭhādhyāyasya dvitīyāhnikam śaṣṭho 'dhyāyaś ca Thakur

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1

[f. 139^{v.8}] (trivi)dhā¹ śāstrasya pravṛttiḥ—uddeśo lakṣaṇaṃ parīkṣā ceti² caturvi-
dhā vā—uddeśo vibhāgo lakṣaṇaṃ parīkṣā ceti | tatra guṇānām² uddeśavibhāgau
rū(parasagandhaspa)rsāḥ³ saṃkhyā ityādisūtreṇa [cf. 1.1.5] prathamādhyāye
kṛtau | lakṣaṇam api dravyāśrayī na guṇavān ityādisūtreṇa [cf. 1.1.16] tatraiva
kṛtam | parīkṣāpy⁴ ayaṃ guṇo 'smi(nn ayaṃ guṇo 'smi)[f. 140^v]nn⁵ ity evaṃrūpā⁶
rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivyādisūtrair⁷ [cf. 2.1.1 and following] dvitīyā-
dhyāye kṛte[[ti]]⁸ kimarthaḥ saptamo 'dhyāya ity āśaṅkāṃ pariharaṇaṃ saptamaṃ
adhyāyam āra)bhate—⁹

· uktā guṇā[[h]] ||¹⁰ 7.1.1

guṇalakṣaṇaṃ cuktam || 7.1.2

idam evaṃguṇam¹¹ idam evaṃguṇam iti cuktam || · 7.1.3¹²

satyam—uddeśavibhāgalakṣaṇāny¹³ uktāni | parīkṣā na kṛteti tadarthaṃ saptamā-
dhyāyārambhaḥ | dvitīye¹⁴ guṇaparī(kṣ)(āpi vṛ)tteti¹⁵ cet—na, tasya dravyalakṣa-
ṇādiparatvā[[t]] ||¹⁶

· pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā anityā eva || 7.1.4¹⁷

tatrānityapṛthivīrūpādīnām āśrayanāśān nāśaḥ—

agnisaṃyogāc ca || 7.1.5¹⁸

1 (trivi)dhā: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. . . dhā (*space for up to 3 akṣaras*) MS

2 guṇānām: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. guṇānnaram MS

3 rū(parasagandhaspa)rsāḥ: *em. with Thakur*. rū. . . rsāḥ (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS

4 parīkṣāpy: MS, parīkṣā[yāṃ a]py Thakur

5 'smi(nn ayaṃ guṇo 'smi)nn: *conj.*, smi. . . nn (*space for up to 8 akṣaras*) MS. 'sminn Thakur

6 evaṃrūpā: MS, evaṃrūpā[yāṃ] Thakur

7 °sūtrair: *conj.*, °sūtreṇa MS Thakur

8 kṛte[[ti]]: *em.*, kṛte MS, kṛtāyāṃ Thakur

9 saptama(madhyāyam āra)bhate: *em. with Thakur*. saptama. . . bhate (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS

10 guṇā[[h]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. guṇā MS

11 idam evaṃguṇam: MS^{pc} Thakur, idavegaṃguṇam MS^{cc}

12 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 printed as part of commentary to 7.1.1 by Thakur

13 uddeśavibhāgalakṣaṇāny: *em.*, uddeśyavibhāgalakṣaṇāny MS, uddeśalakṣaṇavibhāgāny Tha-
kur

14 dvitīye: MS^{pc} Thakur, dvitīya MS^{cc}

15 °parī(kṣ)(āpi vṛ)tteti: *em.*, °parī(kṣ). . . tteti (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS, °parīkṣotteti Tha-
kur

16 °paratvā[[t]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*. °paratvā MS

17 7.1.4 printed as part of commentary to 7.1.1 by Thakur

18 7.1.5 printed as part of commentary to 7.1.1 by Thakur

ghaṭanāśe tadrūpādīnām nāśadarśanāt, āpākanikṣiptaghaṭāgnisaṃyogānantaram
śyāmādivināśadarśanāc ca | tatrāpy āśrayanāśād eva naśyanti cet—na, mānābhā-
vāt | vimatā rūpādayo ghaṭanāśanāśyāḥ, ghaṭarūpādītvāt, naṣṭaghaṭarūpādivad iti
cet—na, ghaṭāntaranāśanāśyātvasiddhyāpy asya caritārthat (vād, ā)(p)āko¹⁹ ddhārā-
nantaram sa evāyaṃ ghaṭa iti pratyabhijñā[[nā]]c ca ||²⁰

[[guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt ||]] 7.1.6²¹

yadi vahnisaṃyogāt prācīnaśyāmādayo na nivartante, na tarhi raktādīnām
udbhavaḥ sambhavati ||

· etena nityeṣv apy anityatvam uktam || 7.1.7

etenāgnisaṃyogā[[d]]²² rūpāntarādīprādurbhāvena pārthivaparamāṇurūpādīnām
apy anityatvaṃ samarthanīyam ||

· apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityatvaṃ dravyanītyatvāt || 7.1.8

salilaparamāṇurūparasasparśāḥ, tejahparamāṇurūpasparśau, vāyuparamāṇusparśas
ca²³—ete na naśyanti paramāṇūnām nityatvena rūpādīnāśahetor āśrayanāśasyābhā-
vāt | agnisaṃyogas tannāśahetur iti cet—na, sahasraśo 'gnisaṃyoge 'pi pūrvarūpā-
dyaparāvṛtteḥ ||²⁴

· anityeṣv anityā dravyanītyatvāt || 7.1.9

[f. 140^v] anityeṣūdakatejovāyuṣu vartamānā²⁵ rūpādayo 'py anityāḥ,²⁶ āśrayanāśa-
sya tannāśahetoḥ sattvāt ||

· kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyām || 7.1.10

pākajās ca || 7.1.11

dvividhā²⁷ pṛthivī—kāryā nityā ca | tatra kāryapṛthivyām rūpādayaḥ kāryāḥ
kāraṇaguṇapūrvakās ca | tathā hi—pārthivaparamāṇurūparasagandhasparśebhyaḥ
pārthive²⁸ dvyānūke rūparasagandhasparśāḥ, tebhyaḥ tryānūke, tebhyaḥ caturānū-
ke | evam antyāvay[[av]]i²⁹ paryantam | pākajās cāpākanīhitakumbhādīrūpādīnām

19 °t(vād, ā)(p)āko°: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °t... (p)āko° (*space for up to 2 akṣaras*) MS

20 pratyabhijñā[[nā]]c ca: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, pratyabhijñāc ca MS

21 7.1.6 omitted in MS and Thakur

22 °saṃyogā[[d]]: *conj.*, °saṃyoga° MS, °saṃyogato Thakur

23 °sparśas ca: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °sparśac ca MS

24 °parāvṛtteḥ: MS, °parāpṛtteḥ Thakur

25 vartamānā: *em.*, vartamāna^(e) MS Thakur

26 anityāḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, anityaḥ MS

27 dvividhā: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, dvividham MS

28 pārthive: MS, pārthiva° Thakur

29 antyāvay[[av]]i°: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, antyāvayi° MS

anvayavyatirekābhyām agnisamyogajatvāvadhārāṇāt, pārthivānurūpādīnām
anītyatve satyāśrāvaṇatve sati nityaviśeṣaguṇatvena buddhyādivat samyogajatvā-
numānāt | tasmāt kvacit kār्याpṛthivyām rūpādayaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ. kvacit
pākajāḥ | pārthivaparamāṇuṣu pākajā eva ||

ātreya-praśastapādādayas tu kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyām iti sūtram kār्या-
pṛthivirūpādīnām kāraṇaguṇapūrvakatvapratipādakam. vahnīsamyogajāś ceti³⁰
sūtram tu paramāṇupṛthivirūpādīnām pākajatvapratipādakam iti vyācakṣate
prakriyā tu—prathamakṣaṇe vahnyabhīghātān nodanād vāpākanīhitakumbhādi-
paramāṇuṣu dvyaṇukārambhaka(samyo)ga³¹ virodhivibhāgārambhakam karma.
dvitīye³² kṣaṇe dvyaṇukārambhakasamyogavirodhivibhāgaḥ. tṛtīya³³ kṣaṇe
dvyaṇukārambhakasamyogānāśa(h), (caturthakṣaṇe)³⁴ dvyaṇukanāśaḥ. pañca-
makṣaṇe paramāṇuśyāmādīnām agnisamyogā[n]³⁵ nāśaḥ, sakriyasya paramāṇor
ākāśādīnā vibhāgajavibhāgaś ca,³⁶ ṣaṣṭha³⁷ kṣaṇe 'nyasmād agni' [f. 141] sam-
yogād³⁷ raktādīnām utpattiḥ paramāṇor ākāśādīnā pūrvasamyoganivṛtiś ca.
saptamakṣaṇe paramāṇvantarena samyogaḥ, aṣṭame³⁸ kṣa(ṇe dvyaṇu)kotpattiḥ.³⁹
navamakṣaṇe kāraṇaguṇapūrvakrameṇa dvyaṇuke rūpād[y]utpattir⁴⁰ iti tad
ayuktam, pramāṇābhāvāt, pratyabhijñāvirodhasyoktatvāc ca ||

• apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ || 7.1.12

kāryodakādaupādāyaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ, udakādyavayavarūpādibhir u[da]-
kādyavayavirūpādyārambhasya⁴¹ pratyakṣasiddhatvāt ||

• pākajā na vidyante || 7.1.13⁴²

kāryodakādirūpādayo nāgnīsamyogajāḥ, udakādirūpādītvāt, udakaparamāṇvādirū-
pādīvat | udakaparamāṇvādirūpādayo na pākajāḥ, nītyatvāt, gaganavat |

30 °samyogajāś ceti: MS, °samyog[āt pākaj]āś ceti Thakur

31 °(samyo)ga°: em. with Thakur. °... ga° (space for up to 2 akṣaras) MS

32 dvitīye: MS, dvitīya° Thakur

33 tṛtīya°: em. with Thakur (silently). tṛtī° MS

34 (caturthakṣaṇe): em. with Thakur, ... (space for up to 5 akṣaras, but probably not enough for caturthe kṣaṇe) MS

35 °samyogā[n]: em. with Thakur (silently). °samyogā MS

36 °vibhāgaś ca: em. with Thakur (silently). °vibhāgañ ca MS

37 ṣaṣṭha³⁷ kṣaṇe 'nyasmād agni' samyo[ga]d: conj. ṣaṣ... samyod (space for up to 6 akṣaras) MS, ṣaṣṭha[kṣaṇe bhogyadṛṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇu]samyogād Thakur

38 aṣṭame: MS, aṣṭama° Thakur

39 kṣa(ṇe dvyaṇu)kotpattiḥ: em. with Thakur (silently) (*kṣaṇe [dvyaṇu]kotpattiḥ kṣa... kotpattiḥ (space for up to 4 akṣaras) MS

40 rūpād[y]utpattir: em. with Thakur (silently). rūpādutpattir MS

41 u[da]kādyavayavirūpādyārambhasya: em. with Thakur (silently). ūkādyavayavirūpādyārambhakasya MS

42 7.1.13 printed as part of the commentary on 7.1.12 by Thakur

· [[aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt]]⁴³ karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.14

dravyam hi guṇānām samavāyikāraṇam | na ca guṇakarmanī⁴⁴ dravyam,⁴⁵ ato na tatra guṇārambhāḥ | guṇakarmanī na⁴⁵ guṇavati, adravyatvāt | yad guṇavat ta[[d]]⁴⁶ dravyam, yathā ghaṭaḥ | śuklaḥ paṭa ity atra śuklapratyayas tu dravye śuklaguṇayogāt, rūpe śuklatvajātiyogāt, na tu rūpasya śuklaguṇavattvāt | śuklo gacchatīti pratyayas tu dravye śuklaguṇakarmayogāt, na tu karmaṇa[[h]]⁴⁷ śuklaguṇavattvāt ||

etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ ||⁴⁸ 7.1.15

etena dravyasya guṇārambhapratipādanena ||

· ekadravyatvāc ca || 7.1.16

śyāmaraktādīnām virodho deśabhedena vā kālabhedena vā parihāryaḥ | na caiṣā[[m]]⁴⁹ deśabhedo 'sti, ekadravyāśritatvāt | tasmāt kālabhedena virodhahparihāraḥ | tasmāc chyāmādinivṛtṭyanantaram śyāmādi[[ni]]vṛttisamaye⁵⁰ vā raktādīnām utpattiḥ ||

· aṇo[[r]]⁵¹ mahataś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || · 7.1.17

caturthādhyāya iti śeṣaḥ | aṇor [[an]]upalabdhīḥ, mahata upalabdhīḥ⁵² caturthe hi mahaty anekadravya[[vat]]tvād⁵³ rūpāc copalabdhīḥ [4.1.5], adravya[[vat]]tvāt⁵⁴ paramāṇāv anupalabdhīḥ [4.1.6] iti sūtradvayam ||

kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || · 7.1.18

kāraṇabahutvād⁵⁵ yathā apracitadvyaṇukatrāyārabdhattrāṇuke, tasya kāraṇasya mahattvābhāvāt pracayābhāvāc ca | kāraṇamahattvād yathā apracitatanudvayārabdhadvitantukādu, tatra kāraṇabahutvapracyābhāvāt | pracayaviśeṣaḥ kāraṇapracayaḥ, tasmād yathā pracitattrāṇukadvayārabdhakāryadravye, tatra kāraṇabahutvābhāvāt kāraṇamahattvasya sato 'py akāraṇatvāt | · kāraṇabahutvamahattvābhyām mahattvam · yathā apracitatulyamahattvatantutrayārabdhattritantukādu |

43 [[aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt]] *conj.*, *om.* MS Thakur

44 guṇakarmanī: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), guṇakarmāṇi MS

45 dravyam ato na tatra guṇārambhāḥ guṇakarmanī na: MS, *om.* Thakur

46 ta[[d]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), ta MS

47 karmaṇa[[h]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), karmmaṇa MS

48 pākajā vyākhyātāḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), pākajādyākhyātāḥ MS

49 caiṣā[[m]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), caiṣā MS

50 śyāmādi[[ni]]vṛttisamaye: *conj.*, śyāmādivṛttisamavāye MS, śyāmādivati samavāyena Thakur

51 aṇo[[r]]: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), aṇo MS

52 aṇor a[[nu]]palabdhīḥ mahata upalabdhīḥ: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), aṇor upalabdhīḥ mahato nupalabdhīḥ MS

53 anekadravya[[vat]]tvād: *em.*, anekadravyatvād MS Thakur

54 adravya[[vat]]tvāt: *em.*, adravyatvāt MS Thakur

55 kāraṇabahutvād: *em. with* Thakur (*silently*), kāraṇamahatvād MS

· kārāṇabahutvapracayābhyāṃ mahattvaṃ yathā pracitatryaṇukārabdhakārya-
dravye | kārāṇabahutvakāraṇamahattvakāraṇapracayebhyo⁵⁶ mahattvaṃ yathā
pracitatantutrayārabdhattritantukādaḥ ||

· tadviparītaṃ aṇu || · 7.1.19⁵⁷

tasman mahattvāt⁵⁸ kārāṇabahutvamahattvapracayajanyād viparītaṃ ||

· aṇu mahad iti tasmin vi(ś)e(śa)bhāvād⁵⁸ viśeṣābhāvāc ca || · 7.1.20

tasmin prasiddhāmālakādāv aṇuvyavahāro [[bilvaparimāṇāpekṣayā]]⁵⁹ mahattva-
prakarṣābhāvagūṇayogāt,⁶⁰ śā(śtrasiddhadvyaṇu)k(e)⁶¹ mahad iti vyavahāro 'pi
paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣagūṇayogāt ||
mukh[[y]]e⁶² bādhakam āha—

· ekakālatvāt || 7.1.21

aṇumahattva(yor virodha)[f. 142^r]parihāro⁶³ dharmibhedāt kālabhedād vā |
· nātra dharmibhedāḥ, bilvāmālakadvyaṇukāder ekatvāt | nāpi kālabhedāḥ.
aṇumahadvyavahārayor⁶⁴ eka(k)(ālatvāt ||
ka)tham⁶⁵ aṇutvamahattvayor virodhaḥ | ata āha—

· drṣṭāntāc ca || · 7.1.22

yad aṇu na tan mahat, yathāṇuḥ,⁶⁶ yan mahat tan nāṇu, yathākāśam iti paraspara-
parihāreṇaivopalambhād virodha[[h]]⁶⁷ śītoṣṇasparśayor iva ||

56 kārāṇabahutvakāraṇamahattvakāraṇapracayebhyo... mahattvāt (in commentary on 7.1.19):
MS. om. Thakur

57 7.1.19 om. Thakur (see previous note)

58 vi(ś)e(śa)bhāvād: em. with Thakur (silently), vi... bhāvād (space for 2 akṣaras, the first of
which had medial e) MS

59 [[bilvaparimāṇāpekṣayā]]: conj. om. MS Thakur

60 mahattvaparakarṣābhāvagūṇayogāt: MS^{Pc}; after °pra° the scribe first wrote °cayajanyād
viparītaṃ · aṇu mahad iti (eyeskip backward) then cancelled all this by bracketing it, mahattva-
pracayajanyād viparītaṃ aṇumahad iti kāryābhāvagūṇayogāt Thakur

61 śā(śtrasiddhadvyaṇu)k(e): conj., ga... ka (space for up to 5 akṣaras) MS. [śāganamahattvāpa-
karṣāmahattvake tasmin] Thakur

62 mukh[[y]]e: em. with Thakur (silently), mukhe MS

63 aṇumahattva(yor virodha)parihāro: em., aṇumahatva... parihāro (space for up to 6 akṣaras)
MS, aṇutvamahattvayor virodhāparihāro Thakur

64 aṇumahadvyavahārayor: em. with Thakur (silently), aṇumahadvyavahārayor MS

65 eka(k)(ālatvāt || ka)tham: em., eka(k)... tham (space for up to 4 akṣaras) MS. eka[kālatvāt,
ekatra sadbhāve ka]tham Thakur

66 yathāṇuḥ: MS, yathāṇu Thakur

67 virodha[[h]]: em. with Thakur, virodha MS

· aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvaḥ karmaguṇaiḥ⁶⁸ vyākhyātāḥ || 7.1.23

aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā agūṇāḥ || 7.1.24⁶⁹

guṇakarmanī nāṇutva⁷⁰ mahattvavatī, adravyatvāt, aṇutvamahattvavat ||

etena dīrghatvahasvatvayor upalabdhyānupalabdhī⁷¹ nitye vyākhyāte ||
7.1.25

· karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.26

guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.1.27

vyākhyātā iti śeṣaḥ | karmabhir dṛṣṭāntair guṇaiś ca dṛṣṭāntair⁷² dīrghatvahasvatvayor karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ | dīrghatvahasvatve na karmavatī nāpi śuklādimaṭī, adravyatvāt, karmavat, śuklādivac ca ||

· etad anityam || 7.1.28

etac caturvidham⁷³ utpādyam parimāṇam anityam vināśi | kiṃ vināśakāraṇam ity atrāpy etad evottaram—etad anityam⁷³ etad iti kāryacaturvidhaparimāṇādhikāraṇam dravyam parāmṛṣati | tataś cāśrayanāśāt kāryacaturvidhaparimāṇanāśa iti sūtrārthaḥ ||

· nityam parimaṇḍalam || 7.1.29

paramāṇuparimāṇam nityam avināśi | katham ity atrāpy etad evottaram—nityam parimaṇḍalam | parimaṇḍalam asyāstīti parimaṇḍalam paramāṇuḥ⁷⁴ |⁷⁴ tenāśrayanāśābhāvāt⁷⁵ paramāṇuparimāṇam nityam ||

· avidyā vidyāliṅgam ||⁷⁶ 7.1.30

avidyā vyāptismṛtiḥ, smṛter avidyātvāt | vidyā pakṣa[[dharma]]tva⁷⁷ pratītiḥ | hrasvatvāṇutvayor iti śeṣaḥ | dvyanukam aṇutvā[[ti]]rikta⁷⁸ parimāṇa[f. 142^v]vat, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavat ||

68 karmaguṇaiḥ⁶⁸: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, karmaguṇe MS

69 Before 7.1.24, which is printed as part of commentary Thakur conjecturally adds a sūtra [aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ]

70 nāṇutva⁷⁰: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, hāṇutva⁷⁰ MS

71 upalabdhyānupalabdhī: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, upalabdhyānupalabdhī MS

72 dṛṣṭāntair: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, dṛṣṭāntai MS

73 etac caturvidham... etad anityam: MS, *om. Thakur (eyeskip)*

74 paramāṇuḥ⁷⁴: *em.*, paramāṇu MS Thakur

75 °nāśābhāvāt: *em. with Thakur⁷⁵*, °nāśābhāvāt MS, °nāśā[tvā]bhāvāt Thakur⁷⁵

76 avidyā vidyāliṅgam: MS, avidyā ca vidyāliṅgam Thakur

77 pakṣa[[dharma]]tva⁷⁷: *conj.*, pakṣatva⁷⁷ MS Thakur

78 aṇutvā[[ti]]rikta⁷⁸: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, aṇutvārikta⁷⁸ MS

· vibhavān mahān ākāśas tathā cātmā || 7.1.31

tadabhāvād aṇu manah || 7.1.32

vibhavo yugapat sarvamūrtadravyasaṃyogaḥ | cakāro 'nuktadīrghatvādisamucca-
yārthaḥ | mano 'ṇu, avibhutve⁷⁹ sati nityadravyatvāt, udakaparamāṇuvāt |

· guṇair dig vyākhyātā ||⁸⁰ 7.1.33

sarvagatā⁸¹ parama[[ma]]hatī⁸² ceti śeṣaḥ ||

kāraṇena kālāḥ ||· 7.1.34

paratvāparatvapūrvādipratyaya-kāraṇena diśā kālāḥ sarvagataḥ paramamahāṃś ca
vyākhyātaḥ ||

iti saptamasya prathamam āhnikam ||⁸³

79 avibhutve: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, avihutve MS

80 dig vyākhyātā: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, dik vyākhyātāḥ MS

81 sarvagatā: *em.*, sarvagata^(o) MS Thakur

82 parama[[ma]]hatī: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, paramahatī MS

83 iti saptamasya prathamam āhnikam: MS (*there is a sign which I interpret as a stylized śrī before and after the colophon*), iti śrīmadvaiśeṣike darśane saptamādhyāyasya prathamāhnikam Thakur

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 2

rūparasagandhasparśavyatirekāḍ arthāntaram ekatvam || 7.2.1

gandhābhāve 'py udakāḍau, rasābhāve 'pi vahnyāḍau, rūpābhāve 'pi pavanāḍau,
sparśābhāve 'py ākāśāḍav ekatvam upalabhyate | tasmāḍ rūpāḍibhyo bhinnam |
evam guṇāntarāḍibhyo 'py ekatvasya¹ bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ ||

· tathā pṛthaktvam || 7.2.2

yathāikatvam rūpāḍibhyo bhidyate tathāikatpṛthaktvam api | samarthite caikatvaika-
pṛthaktve anekatvānekatpṛthaktve ca ||

tayor nityatvānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyaḥ² vyākhyāte || 7.2.3

niṣpattiś ca || 7.2.4

yathā² tejaso rūpasparśau paramāṇuṣu nityāv anyatrāśrayanāśān naśyataḥ, tathāika-
tvaikatpṛthaktve | yathā ca tau kārye kāraṇaguṇapūrvakau tathāikatvaikatpṛthaktve
ca ||

ekatvaikatpṛthaktvayor ekatvaika(pṛ)thaktvābhāvo⁵ 'ṇu[[tva]]ma-
hattvābhyaḥ⁶ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.5

karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.6

guṇair guṇāḥ ||⁷ 7.2.7

gatārthāṇi sūtrāṇi, nyāyasya tulyatvāt ||

· niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmaguṇānāṃ sarvaikatvam na vidyate || 7.2.8

(sarvaṃ gu)ṇakarmāḍikam⁸ ekam eveti māyāvedāntinaḥ | tan na, sarvaikatvasya
vyāhatatvāt | guṇakarmāḍaya ekatvasaṃkhyārahitaḥ, adravyatvā[[t]],⁹ na yad
evam¹⁰ na ta(d evam, yathā ghaṭaḥ ||)¹¹

1 guṇāntarāḍibhyo 'py ekatvasya: MS. guṇāntarāḍibhyaḥ anekatvasya Thakur

2 rūpasparśābhyaḥ... yathā (in commentary on 7.2.4): MS. om. Thakur

3 7.2.3 printed as part of commentary on 7.2.2 by Thakur

4 7.2.4 not in Thakur (cf. note 2)

5 ekatvaika(pṛ)thaktvābhāvo: em. with Thakur (silently), ekatvaika... thaktvābhāvo (space for 1 akṣara) MS

6 'ṇu[[tva]]mahattvābhyaḥ: em.. 'ṇumahattvābhyaḥ MS Thakur

7 guṇāḥ: em. with Thakur, guṇaḥ MS

8 (sarvaṃ gu)ṇakarmāḍikam: conj., ... ṇakarmāḍikam (space for up to 4 akṣaras) MS. [gu]ṇakarmāḍikam Thakur

9 adravyatvā[[t]]: em. with Thakur (silently), adra(g)yatvā MS

10 na yad evam: conj., na naivaṃ MS Thakur

11 na ta(d evam yathā ghaṭaḥ): conj., na ta... (space for up to 6 akṣaras) MS. na naivaṃ yathā [ghaṭaḥ] Thakur

ekasyābhāvād bhāktam na vidyate || 7.2.9

bhāktam amukhyam | sarvavyatiriktasyābhāvāt katham tadgatam ekatvam sarvas-
minn āropyeta vyavahriyeta vā ||

a(va)(yāvāyavino)r¹² guṇaguṇinoḥ kriyāadvator ekatvapṛthakte mīmāṃ-
sakakṣapaṇakādayo¹³ varṇayanti, bhedābhedasvīkārāt | tad dūṣayati—

kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛ(thakte na)¹⁴
vidyete ||¹⁵ 7.2.10

kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthakte na sambhavataḥ, eka[tva]syāneka¹⁶ kāryakāraṇa-
niṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ,¹⁷ guṇatvena¹⁸ guṇaniṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ ca, pṛthaktvasyāpi
guṇatvena guṇādinīṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ¹⁸ etena jātivyaktyor api bhedābhedau
nirastau ||

• etad anityayor vyākhyātam || 7.2.11

aneka[tva]m¹⁹ anekapṛthaktvam cānityayor vartamānam vyākhyātam—āśrayanā-
śān naśyatīti ||

• anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarma[ja]ḥ²⁰ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ ||
7.2.12

anyatarakarmajaḥ kriyāvatā niṣkriyasya, yathā sthāṇo[ja]ḥ²¹ śyenena, vibhūnām
ca mūrtaiḥ²² ubhayakarmajo viruddhakriyayoḥ, yathā mallayor meṣayor vā,
agrhyamānaviśeṣatvenobhayakarmanōḥ saṃyoga²³ kāraṇatvāt | saṃyoga[ja]ś
ca²⁴ dvedhā—kāraṇa²⁵ saṃyogajaḥ kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyoga[ja]ś ca²⁶ ādya yathā

12 a(va)(yāvāyavino)r: *em.*, a(va)...r (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS, a[nyad eva] Thakur

13 *kṣapaṇakādayo: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, *kṣapaṇakādayor MS

14 ekatvapṛ(thakte na): *em.*, ekatvapṛ... (*space for up to 3 akṣaras*) MS, eka[tvapṛthaktvam na] Thakur

15 vidyete: MS, vidyate Thakur

16 eka[tva]syāneka: *em.*, ekasyāneka° MS Thakur

17 *tvānupapatteḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, *tvāt dupapatteḥ MS

18 guṇatvena... guṇādinīṣṭhatvānupapatteḥ: MS, *om.* Thakur (eyeskip)

19 aneka[tva]m: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, anekam MS

20 ubhayakarma[ja]ḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, ubhayakarmanas MS

21 sthāṇo[ja]ḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, sthāṇo MS

22 mūrtaiḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, mūrteḥ MS

23 *karmanōḥ saṃyoga: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, *karmanōḥ saṃyoga° MS

24 saṃyoga[ja]ś ca: *em.*, saṃyogaś ca MS, saṃyogaś ca [saṃyogajo] Thakur

25 kāraṇa: *em. with Thakur*, karaṇa° MS

26 kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyoga[ja]ś ca: *em.*, kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaś ca MS, kāraṇāk[ā]raṇasaṃyo-
ga[ja]ś ca Thakur

tantukarmajanyatantvantarasamyo[[gā]]t²⁷ tantvantarasamyuktākāśādisamyogaḥ |
dvābhyām yathā tantvākāśasamyogābhyām dvitantukākāśasamyogaḥ | dvitīyas
tu hastakuḍyasamyogāc charīrakuḍyasamyogaḥ | trividhaś ca samyogaḥ | co
'vadhāraṇe ||

vibhūnām ajaḥ samyogaś caturtho 'stīti cet—na, mānābhāvāt | vibhū
mitha[[h]]²⁸ samyujyete, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavad²⁹ iti cet—na, tantupaṭāḍau vyabhi-
cārā[f. 143^v]t | ārabhyārambhakabhāvavirahe³⁰ satīti viśeṣaṇīyam³¹ iti cet—na,
himavadvindhyādāv anutpannasamyoge³² naṣṭapaṭāḍau [[ca]]³³ vyabhicārāt ||

· etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.13

samyogavad vibhāgo 'py anyatarakarmaja³⁴ ubhayakarmajo vibhāgajaś ca
vibhāgaḥ³⁵ ādyo [[yathā]]³⁶ sthāṇo[[h]]³⁷ śyenena | dvitīyo yathā mallayoḥ |
kāraṇamātravibhāgād yathā vaṃśadalavibhāgād vaṃśadalākāśādivibhāgaḥ |
kāraṇākāraṇavibhāgād yathāṅgulikuḍyavibhāgād dhastakuḍyavibhāgāc ca śarīra-
kuḍyavibhāga iti ||

· samyogavibhāgayoḥ samyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyām
vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.14

karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.15

guṇair guṇā[[h]] ||³⁸ 7.2.16

iti sūtratrayaṃ gatārtham ||

· yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ samyogavibhāgau na vidyete ||³⁹
· 7.2.17

yutau samyuktāv iti siddhir yutasiddhiḥ, samyuktāv iti pratītiḥ | tadabhāvān nāra-
bhyārambhakayoḥ samyogau syātām | sambandhapratyayo 'stīti cet—tarhi samba-

27 °samyo[[gā]]t: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °samyot MS

28 mitha[[h]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, mitha MS

29 ghaṭavad: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, ghaṭavatd MS

30 °bhāvavirahe: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °bhāve virahe MS

31 viśeṣaṇīyam: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, viśeṣaṇīyaṃ MS

32 anutpannasamyoge: *em., adutpannasamyoge MS, utpannasamyoge Thakur*

33 [[ca]]: *conj., om. MS Thakur*

34 anyatarakarmaja: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, anyatarakarmmakarmaja MS

35 vibhāgaḥ: MS, *om. Thakur*

36 ādyo [[yathā]]: *conj., ādya MS, ādyaḥ Thakur*

37 sthāṇo[[h]]: *em. with Thakur*, sthāṇo MS

38 guṇā[[h]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, guṇā MS

39 vidyete: *em., vidyate MS Thakur*

ndha[ḥ]⁴⁰ syāt, sa tu samavāyaḥ | ayaṃ paṭo naitattantusamyuktaḥ, tadārabhya-
tvāt, tanturūpavat | saṃyogābhāvāc ca⁴¹ tadvināśakavibhāgābhāvāḥ ||

· guṇatvāc ca || 7.2.18⁴²

paṭarūpādayo ||na saṃyo||gavibhāgavantaḥ,⁴³ guṇatvāt, saṃyogavat ||
vācyavācakayoḥ sambandho⁴⁴ 'stīty ata āha—

· guṇe ca bhā(ṣyate) ||⁴⁵ 7.2.19

na kevalaṃ vācako guṇaḥ, guṇe ca bhāṣyate, śuklādaḥ saṃketyate | tena vācyavā-
cakayor guṇatvān na saṃyogavibhāgau staḥ ||
ubhayor gama(naṃ nāsti—

niṣkri) yatvā[ṭ] ||⁴⁶ 7.2.20

na tāvad dhimavadādipadaṃ dakṣiṇāpathoccāritaṃ⁴⁷ yāvad dhimavantaṃ gac-
chatī, nāpi himavadādādayo dakṣiṇāpathoccāritahimavadādīpa(ḍaṃ gatvā tatra
ti)[f. 144^r]ṣṭhante⁴⁸ yogyānupalambhabādhāt | niṣkriyaḥ⁴⁹ śabda ākāśādayaś ca,
tat kathaṃ teṣāṃ saṃyogaḥ ||
upasaṃharati—

· śabdārthāḥ⁵⁰ asambandhau || 7.2.21

tasmād iti śeṣaḥ ||

· saṃyo(gino daṇḍāt sama)vāyino⁵¹ viṣāṇāc ca drṣṭatvād ahetuḥ ||
7.2.22

balīvardo⁵² viṣāṇīyādaḥ viśiṣṭapratyayatvam anaikāntikam ||

- 40 sambandha[ḥ]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, sambandha MS
41 saṃyogābhāvāc ca: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, saṃyogābhāvāc ca MS
42 7.2.18 printed as part of the commentary on 7.2.17 by Thakur
43 ||na saṃyo||gavibhāgavantaḥ: *conj.*, gavibhāgavantaḥ MS, na vibhāgavantaḥ Thakur
44 sambandho: MS, [saṃyogaḥ] sambandho Thakur
45 ca bhā(ṣyate): *em.*, ca bhā... (space for up to 3 akṣaras) MS, [ca bhāṣyate] || 16 ||
46 [niṣkri]yatvāt || 17 || Thakur
47 ubhayor gama(naṃ nāsti niṣkri) yatvā[ṭ]: *conj.*, ubhayor ggama... yatvā (space for up to 6 akṣaras) MS, ubhayo[r gatyādyabhāvāt] Thakur (*cf. previous note*)
48 dakṣiṇāpathoccāritaṃ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, dakṣiṇāpathoccāritaṃ MS
49 *himavadādīpa(ḍaṃ gatvā tatra ti)ṣṭhante: *conj.*, *himavadādīpa... ṣṭhante (space for up to 8 akṣaras) MS, *himavadādī[bhīḥ samaṃ saṃyujya]nte Thakur
50 niṣkriyaḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, niṣkriyaḥ MS
51 śabdārthāḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, śabdārthā MS
52 saṃyo(gino daṇḍāt sama)vāyino: *em. with Thakur*, saṃyo... vāyino (space for up to 8 akṣaras) MS
52 balīvardo: MS, daṇḍī puruṣo balīvardo Thakur

tathāpratyayābhāvāt || 7.2.23

saṁdehaḥ || 7.2.24⁵³

sambandhapūrvakatva[[m]]⁵⁴ pratijñāya (yadi viśi)ṣṭapra[[tya]]ya[[h]] syāt⁵⁵ saṁde-
ha[[h]]⁵⁶ syāt—sambandhapūrvako na veti ||

katham tarhi devadattapadād devadatte dhīr na⁵⁷ yajñadatta ity ata āha—

· sāmaya[[ka]]h⁵⁸ śabdārthapratyayaḥ || 7.2.25

samayena siddhaḥ sāmayaḥ | samayaḥ saṁketah | yat padaṁ yatra saṁketyate tat
tasya pratyāyakam⁵⁹ nānyasyeti saṁketān niyama iti ||

ekadikkālābhyām⁶⁰ sannikṣṭaviprakṣṭābhyām param aparam ||⁶¹ .
7.2.26

ekasyām diśi pūrvasyām paścimāyām vā sthitābhyām svaśarīrāpekṣayā saṁyukta-
saṁyogabhūya(stvālpī)yastva⁶²saṁyuktābhyām paratvam aparatvam ca janyate |
parāparaśabdayor guṇavacanayoḥ⁶³ para[[h]]⁶⁴ paṭo 'paraḥ paṭa iti dravye prayo-
gaḥ parāparaguṇayogāt ||

· kāraṇaparavāt kāraṇaparavāc ca || 7.2.27

kāraṇam paratvāparatvayor apekṣābuddhiḥ, tasyāḥ paratvam saṁyuktasaṁyogata-
pana⁶⁵parispandabhūyastvaviśayatvam | ta[[syā]]⁶⁶ aparatvam tadalpīyastva⁶⁷viśa-
yatvam | paratvāparatve na sta iti vaktum na yuktam, paro 'yam⁶⁸ aparo 'yam

53 7.2.23 and 7.2.24 printed as part of commentary on 7.2.22 by Thakur

54 °pūrvakatva[[m]]: em. with Thakur, °pūrvakatva MS

55 (yadi viśi)ṣṭapra[[tya]]ya[[h]] syāt: conj. . . . ṣṭaprayasyāt (space for up to 4 akṣaras; bottom
of first consistent with ya) MS, [hetor viśi]ṣṭapratyayasyo[ktau] Thakur

56 saṁdeha[[h]]: em. with Thakur (silently), sandeha MS

57 dhīr na: em. with Thakur (silently), dhīna MS

58 sāmaya[[ka]]h: em. with Thakur (silently), sāmayaś MS

59 pratyāyakam: MS, prayojakam Thakur

60 ekadikkālābhyām: MS, ekadikkābhyām Thakur

61 aparam: MS, aparam ca Thakur

62 °bhūya(stvālpī)yastva°: em., °bhūyaḥyastva° (space left open for 1 akṣara) MS,
°bhūya(stvābhū)yastva° Thakur

63 °vacanayoḥ: em. with Thakur (silently), °vacaneyoḥ MS (the e might have been cancelled)

64 para[[h]]: em. with Thakur (silently), para MS

65 °tapana°: em. with Thakur (silently), °tavana° MS

66 ta[[syā]]: em. with Thakur, ta MS

67 tadalpīyastva°: em. with Thakur (silently), tadatpīyastva° MS

68 paro 'yam: MS^{2c} Thakur, parayorayam MS^{2c}

ity anubhavāt | viprakṣṭatvaṃ paratvaṃ sannikṣṭatvaṃ⁶⁹ cāparatvaṃ | kāle 'pi para[[h]]⁷⁰ sthaviṛaḥ, aparo yuvā iti pratyayaḥ ||

paratvāparatve guṇau, dravyakarmānyatve sati jātimattvāt, rūpavat | vi-
mate paratvāparatve devadattabuddhiḥ, saty apīndriyasannika[f. 144^v]rṣādaḥ
yajñadattācākṣuṣatve sati devadattacākṣuṣatvāt, dvitvavat | par[[atv]]āparatve⁷¹
mūrtāmūrtasamyogajanye, ekadravyatve 'smadādipratyakṣatve vāvaraṇādyanu-
palabdhi-kāraṇābhāve sati puruṣāntarāpratyakṣayoḥ puruṣāntarapratyakṣatvāt,
sukhādivat ||

paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvāparatvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyā-
khyātaḥ || 7.2.28

karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.29

guṇair guṇā[[h]] ||⁷² 7.2.30

iti sūtratrayaṃ gatārtham ||

· ihedaṃ iti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ [[sa]]⁷³ samavāyaḥ || 7.2.31

kāryakāraṇagrahaṇam⁷⁴ upalakṣaṇam | kāryakāraṇayor guṇaguṇinoḥ kriyātvadva-
tor jātivyaktyor viśeṣatadvator⁷⁵ ihedaṃ iti yataḥ sa samavāyaḥ | iha tantuṣu paṭa
ityādi ||

dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratishedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.32

bhāvaḥ sattā yathā na dravyaṃ na guṇo na karma, pūrvoktahetubhyaḥ, tathā⁷⁶
samavāyo 'pi | na cāyaṃ jātiviśeṣābhāvānām anyatamaḥ, sambandhatvāt, samyo-
gavat | tasmāt padārthāntaraṃ samavāyaḥ ||

· tattvaṃ bhāve[[na]]⁷⁷ || 7.2.33

tasya bhā[[va]]s⁷⁸ tattvaṃ | ya eva tantupaṭayayoḥ samavāyaḥ sa eva jātivyakti[[y]]oḥ⁷⁹
samavā(yo)⁸⁰ 'pi | prayogas tu—jātivyaktyādisamavāyas tantupaṭasamavāyān na

69 sannikṣṭatvaṃ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, sannikṣṭatvāṇi MS

70 para[[h]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, para MS

71 par[[atv]]āparatve: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, parāparatve MS

72 guṇā[[h]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, gguṇā MS

73 [[sa]]: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, om. MS

74 kāryakāraṇagrahaṇam: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, kāryakāraṇagrahaṇagrahaṇam MS

75 viśeṣatadvator: MS, viśeṣatadvato[ś ca] Thakur

76 tathā: MS, tathā [na] Thakur

77 bhāve[[na]]: *em. with Thakur*, bhāve MS

78 bhā[[va]]s: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, bhās MS

79 °vyakti[[y]]oḥ: *em. with Thakur (silently)*, °vyaktos MS

80 samavā(yo): *em. with Thakur (silently)*, samavā... (space for 1 akṣara which had medial a or o) MS

bhidyate, samavāyatvāt, tantupaṭasamavāyavat | samavāyabhedasādha(kalīṅgā-
bh)āvāc ca |⁸¹ tantupaṭasamavāyo ||jātivyaktyādisamavāyād||⁸² bhidyate, tantupa-
ṭasambandhatvāt, tantupaṭasamyogavad iti cet—na, samavāyalakṣaṇābhāvena⁸³
sopādhitvā(t ||

iti sapta)mādhyāyaḥ ||⁸⁴

81 samavāyabhedasādha(kalīṅgābh)āvāc ca: *conj.*, samavāyabhedasādha... vāc ca (*space for up to 5 akṣaras, the last of which had medial ā or o*) MS. samavāyabhedasādhā[ābhā]vāc ca Thakur

82 tantupaṭasamavāyo ||jātivyaktyādisamavāyād||: *conj.*, tantupaṭasamavāyor nna MS. tantupaṭasamavāyo Thakur

83 samavāyalakṣaṇābhāvena: MS^{pc} Thakur. samavāyalakṣaṇābhāyena MS^{ac}

84 sopādhitvā(t iti sapta)mādhyāyaḥ: *em.*, sopādhitvā... mādhyāyaḥ śrī (*space for up to 6 akṣaras*) MS. sopādhitvā[t] || || iti śrīmadvaiśeṣike darśane saptamādhyāyasya dvitīyāhnikam || saptamādhyāyaś ca Thakur

Adhyāya 6, āhnika 1

[Now,] after the investigation of [the category] motion, [the category] quality will be investigated. The sixth *adhyāya* is begun in order to investigate *adr̥ṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma* and *adharmā*), because in comparison with [the other] qualities [they are more highly] respected.¹ In this regard (*tatra*), the authority with regard to [determining what is] the means towards *dharma* and *adharmā*² is the Veda, and it is authoritative through its having been composed by God (*Īśvara*); hence [the *adhyāya* starts with a] sūtra which aims at expounding that (i.e. the fact that the Veda was composed by God)—

The composition of sentences in the Veda³ is preceded by (i.e. produced through) cognition. 6.1.1

- 1 Taking *guṇebhyaḥ* in the expression *guṇebhyo 'bhyarhitavād* as an *ablativus comparationis* though used with the positive (*abhyarhita*) rather than a comparative (*abhyarhitatara*): cf. Speyer 1886 §105 (2ly).
- 2 Though it might at first appear a little odd that *adharmasādhana*s should also be mentioned, this terminology is already used by Praśastapāda, who remarks in the section on *adharmā* in the PDhS. *tasya tu sādhanāni śāstre pratiśiddhāni dharmasādhanaviparītāni hiṃsānṛtasteyādīni vihitākaraṇam pramādaś ca* (280.5–7). Moreover, it may also be pointed out that, among other pieces of exegetical legerdemain, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra proposes reading the very first sūtra of the VS, the famous *athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* a second time (i.e. by *āvṛtti*) assuming elision of a privative *a*, in other words as *athāto 'dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. We are then to understand that the VS is taught also to clear up doubt on the part of those who, having learnt of the existence of hells and other bad rebirths from references in Vedic texts, desire to know what leads to these, in order that they may avoid them: *atrākāraprasaṅgaṇād adharmavyākhyānapratijñāpi draṣṭavyā | tathā ca yato vedārthāvagatanarakādijihāsavaḥ tatsādhanajijñāsavaḥ prcchanti, ato 'dharmam vyākhyāsyāma ity arthaḥ* (TS 8.25–26 ≈ *atrākāraprasaṅgaṇād adharmavyākhyānapratijñāpi draṣṭavyā | yato vedādyavagatanarakādijihāsavaḥ tatsādhanajijñāsavaḥ prcchanti, ato 'dharmam vyākhyāsyāma ity arthaḥ* V 2.8–9; I suspect that *vedārthāvagata*^o in the Tarkasāgara should be emended to *vedādyavagata*^o as transmitted in the abridged version).
- 3 I emend the *vedaḥ* of the manuscript to *vede*, though not without hesitation. Thakur, and following him Jambūvijaya and Nozawa, have retained the manuscript reading, which can also be considered to be supported by the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript's *vedo* (sandhi before the *na* of the following sūtra), though this could of course well be a mechanical corruption of *vede*. On the other hand, *vede* is read by Candrānanda, Śaṅkara Miśra and the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript, and is attested by a quotation in Praśastapāda's PDhS, the wording of which is, in turn, guaranteed by all commentaries on that text. And since Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself commented on Udayana's *Kiraṇāvalī*, which also quotes and discusses the sūtra with the reading *vede*, it can hardly be doubted that he knew this reading as the one sanctioned by the most famous authorities of the Vaiśeṣika system, although, unfortunately, the unique manuscript of the GKṬ breaks off a little before the passage where the sūtra is quoted and discussed. If he here preferred a different reading, it would surely have been for some good reason, and one would expect a discussion of the two readings and their merits. Instead, the commentary does not contain such a discussion, nor even explicitly support *vedaḥ*. Of course the possibility remains that this is due to a particularly unfortunate omission on the part of the abridger, or an accident of

'A composition of sentences' is as much as [to say] 'a sequence of composing of sentences' (*vākyaracanākrama*).⁴ 'Preceded by cognition' [means] produced from the cognition of a soul (*puruṣa*). [Expressed as a formal syllogism, the point made by the sūtra is that] the sequence of sentences in the Veda is one which was produced from the cognition of a soul, because it is a sequence of sentences [and all orders of sentences are produced from the cognition of souls], like the sequence(s) of sentences [produced by] Kālidāsa.⁵

[Now the following] sūtra aims at refuting [the possibility that] . . . by [ordinary people] like us:⁶

transmission, and it must also be admitted that there is no decisive support for *vede* either. However, I find it a little unnatural to take the relationship of the words *veda* and *vākyakrama* in the compound *vedavākyakrama* which occurs in the syllogism below, as a *karmadhāraya*, as one would presumably be meant to do if reading *vedaḥ* in the sūtra. Nor is the parallel compound *kālidāsavākyakramavat* a *karmadhāraya* of course.

If the manuscript reading is retained, the sūtra would presumably be to be translated somewhat as follows: 'The Veda is a composition of sentences [i.e. a sequence of composition of sentences] which is preceded by (i.e. caused) by cognition,' which, though not perhaps inconceivable, seems a little unusual.

- 4 The expression *vākyaracanākrama* as a gloss of *vākyakṛti* is a little unexpected; all other authors who comment on this sūtra explain (*vākyakṛti*) as (*vākyaracanā*). For example Candrānanda has *agnihotraṃ juhuyāt svargakāma ityevambhūtā racanā bhagavato maheśvarasya buddhipūrvā* (45.5–6). Śaṅkara Miśra *vākyakṛtir vākyaracanā, sā buddhipūrvā* (256.8). Vyomaśiva *buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vākyaracanā* (Vyo² vol. 2 168.8–9). Śrīdhara *vede vākyakṛtir vākyaracanā* (NK² 509.4–5). Udayana *vedavākyasya kṛtir vākyaracanā* (KĀ 211.17). However, this is not sufficient reason to suspect a corruption here. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's wording may have been influenced by that of a verse in Kumārila's *Śloka-vārtika*, *teṣāṃ* adṛśyamānānām katham ca racanākramam | kiṁśād racanābhedaḥ varṇabhedas ca jāyate ||* (VI.109). I might add that I do not think that this slightly unconventional gloss allows any conclusion as to our problem of *vedaḥ/vede* in the text of the sūtra.

* Referring to subtle parts. *sūkṣmā bhāgāḥ* of words/sounds, put forward by a (Jaina) *pūrvapakṣin* in the previous verse.

- 5 Thakur's emendation of *kālidāsavākyakramavatto kālidāsādivākyakramavat* may perhaps have been influenced by the form in which essentially the same syllogism is found in some other texts: for example a Nyāya *pūrvapakṣa* within the section on *jaiminidarśana* (i.e. Mīmāṃsā) in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*: *vedavākyāni pauruṣeyāṇi, vākyatvāt, kālidāsādivākyavat* (SDS 103.22–23). However, there seems to be no need to alter the manuscript reading. The parallel at *Tarkasāgara* 48.19–20, *vedavākyam pauruṣeyam, vākyatvāt, kālidāsādivākyavat* can hardly be used as evidence without confirming the actual reading of the manuscripts at this passage: if Thakur silently added an *ādi* at one place in the abridged version, he may equally well have done so at another in the long version.
- 6 No emendation of the lacuna here has occurred to me which fits well with the surviving (parts of) *akṣaras*. Obviously, the required sense is something like 'refuting [the possibility that ordinary people] like us produced the Vedas.' *asmadādiviracitatāparihārārthaṃ* or *asmadādiviracitatāparihārārthaṃ* would provide the desired sense, or even better perhaps (though less close to what we find in the manuscript) *asmadādiviracitatāsaṅkāparihārārthaṃ*. Thakur's conjecture also yields acceptable sense, but is very unlikely to correspond to the original wording.

There is [it is agreed], to start with (*asti tāvat*), an establishing of conventions (*saṃketakarāṇa*) [of using] the words 'brahmin' and so on with regard to brahmins and so on who have arisen at the beginning of creation. And [ordinary people] like us¹³ do not have knowledge of brahminhood and so on at the beginning of creation, for by mere sensory contact (*indriyasannipātamātreṇa*) [we] do not experience brahminhood and so on as differentiated from *kṣatriya*-hood and so on, and because there is no other manifesting factor [which could cause a cognition of brahminhood]. [For] in the first place, a particular kind of form is not a manifesting factor for this [brahminhood] (*atra*), because [the existence of] a particular form [of brahmins and so on which is] differentiated from [those of] *kṣatriyas* and so on is refuted by the fact that [such a form] is not perceived though it [if it existed would be] suitable [to be perceived].¹⁴ Nor is the being born from a mother and father who were already [themselves] brahmins (*brāhmaṇabhūta*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], because this (i.e. the being born from such parents) is not possible at the beginnings of creation.¹⁵ Nor is the being born from [atoms

13 My reconstruction of the lacuna here is consistent with the remaining *akṣaras* in the manuscript and the number of *akṣaras* which may be presumed to have been lost, while yielding, I believe, the correct sense. Thakur's, on the other hand, involves changing °*karāṇa* to °*karo*, does not agree with the size of the lacuna, forces him to alter the subsequent °*brāhmaṇatvādyānanubhāvāt* of the manuscript to °*brāhmaṇatvādyānanubhāvāt*, and, for all that, still does not seem to me to be satisfactory from the point of view of sense and coherence.

14 It is clear that this is the intended sense, and that Thakur's emendation °*viśeṣasya योग्यānupālambha*° for the transmitted °*viśeṣasyāyogyānupālambha*° is correct. The attribution of the fault of *yogyānupālambha* is of course regularly made by Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra in arguments; an instance which employs the same wording we have here is *tad api na, yāgyavahitottarakṣaṇe svarga-sya योग्यānupālambhanirastatvāt* (TS 3.25).

15 The plural in *sargādyeṣu* is perfectly understandable, since creation is a process or phase which is repeated periodically, and the reading of the manuscript has therefore been accepted. It is however not beyond suspicion, as Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra usually employs the singular; cf. for instance *sargādau* at the beginning of the commentary on 6.1.3, or *sṛṣṭyādau* in the commentary on 2.1.18 (quoted in footnote 18 below).

of] elements¹⁶ drawn together¹⁷ by a particular *adrṣṭa* (i.e. in this case *dharmā*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], for when the *adrṣṭa* cannot be known [as is the case for ordinary people] this too cannot be known. Therefore [it is established that] there exists a certain (*kaścīr*) Lord who has direct knowledge of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us [and who] causes the [verbal] conventions [such as that which associates the word *brāhmaṇa* with brahmins] to be grasped.¹⁸ And [it is

16 *bhūta* in the compound *adrṣṭaviśeṣākṛṣṭabhūtajanyatvam* must be understood in the sense of *mahābhūta*. Compare Prāśastapāda's account of how bodies of the *ayoniya* type arise: *ītrāyoni-
nījam* (scil. *śarīram*) *anapekṣya śukraśonītaṃ devaśīnām dharmaviśeṣasahūbhyo 'ṇubhyo
jāyate* (PDhS 27.23–28.2), and note that in Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary on the Kiraṇāvalī
on this PDhS passage we find a *pratīka* introduced with the words *nanv adrṣṭaparigṛhītapara-
mānūnām aviśeṣād yonijāyonijāśarīralakṣaṇaḥ kāryabheda na ghaṭata iti yonijam eva manvā-
deḥ śarīra, ity āśāṅkāṃ apānudanān upasmarati—tasmād iti* (DKT 657.14–16). Even more con-
vincing as a parallel to our passage, confirming the wording of the compound in part at least,
is a sentence from Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary on the *guṇa* section of the Kiraṇāvalī: *yadi
vā brāhmaṇatvavyavasthāpakādrṣṭaviśeṣopagṛhītabhūtajanyatvāder apratyakṣatvād brāhma-
ṇyam anumeyam eva* (DKT 3.23–24). What is potentially confusing in the present case is that
in the preceding compound, *brāhmaṇabhūtamātipitjanyatvam*, *bhūta* clearly has a completely
different meaning. I do not believe, however, that there is corruption here. The usage of *bhūta* to
refer to the five elements is not found in the sūtras, but is well attested in other Vaiśeṣika texts: to
give merely one example, Candrānandān commenting on VS 4.2.3, which he reads *ātmasaṃyo-
gas tv avipratīṣiddho mīthaḥ pañcānām*, writes *ātmasābdena svarūpam | svarūpeṇa pañcānām
api bhūtānām parasparasāyogo na pratiṣidhyate, śarīre 'nārambhakātena | pārthivaśarīre
jalādīni sāmyogīni, na samavāyīni | jalādibhir ayonijam eva śarīra, ārabhyate varuṇalokādaḥ*
(35.14–16).

17 This seems the most fitting translation for *ākṛṣṭa* here.

18 Reading *°grāhayitā*, rather than Thakur's more facile emendation *°grahītā*, for the MS's
°grāhītā. It seems impossible that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra should speak of God as one who merely
grasps (verbal) conventions; instead it is He who creates them and teaches them. The concept
of God teaching *vyavahāra* to people is an old one in Vaiśeṣika; it was employed in a proof for
the existence by God by Prāśastapāda which we find quoted from a lost work of his by Kama-
laśīla (TSP 43.1–5; cf. Chemparathy 1968, 68–72).

With our passage it is necessary to (re)consider also another, closely related, statement in Bhaṭṭa
Vādindra's VS commentary, which has been discussed by Wezler (1982b, 96–98, referring
to the commentary as anonymous). Ad 2.1.18 we read in the abridged version as printed by
Thakur *asyeyam saṃjñeśvarasyābhipretejījñānam saṃjñākarma | tac ca nāsmadādīnām yoga-
jadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* | nāpi līṅgajanyam | sṛṣṭyādaḥ manvādibhiḥ
paramēśvarābhiprāyavyāptalīṅgānavagamāt | tasmān mahādevaprasādāsādītaḥ yojajadharma-
sadhrīcīnamanasā vāyavādayo vāyavādīpadair boddhavyā itīśvarābhimatam iti manvādibhir
niścīyata iti manvādīnām sarvajñatvasiddhiḥ* (22.15; for a translation see Wezler 1982b, 97).
While suggesting that the ideas about creation found in this passage may go back to an earlier
period, perhaps to Prāśastapāda himself, Wezler states that 'according to this theory, God does
not himself teach language to the first men (i.e. by indicating the objects and uttering their desig-
nations); rather, his intention has to be cognized, and this cannot be accomplished by 'mere mor-
tals', for God's intention can neither be perceived nor inferred; only persons who are endowed

also established that] there exist certain [extraordinary persons] who have direct knowledge—attained through His favour—of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us, [and who] grasp the [verbal] conventions [created and revealed by God].

The authoritative nature of the Vedas having been [thus] established, [the *sūtra-kāra*] begins [the following sequence of *sūtras*] in order to expound the means towards *dharma* which is expounded by those [Vedic texts]:

Giving, preceded by [orthodoxly pious] cognitions [, is a means towards obtaining *dharma*]. 6.1.4

[The word] *dadāti* [which when inflected as a noun ordinarily refers to the verbal root (*dhānu*) $\sqrt{dā}$] is used [here] by secondary usage (*lakṣaṇayā*) to mean that which is designated by [that] verbal root [$\sqrt{dā}$].¹⁹ [And] 'cognition' [here means] orthodoxly pious cognition (*āstikyabuddhi*). Giving preceded by faith, is a means to-

with a peculiar faculty of cognition can have insight into it, and it is they who, in their turn, teach all others how to speak' (1982b. 98). This interpretation of the commentary on 2.1.18, according to which Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's theory on the origin of language would differ importantly from that of Praśastapāda and of Udayana, would contradict the reading I have restored here ad 6.1.3. However, the fuller version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's commentary, which was not available to Wezler, though itself corrupt, shows that the abridged version as preserved most probably does not make Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's full intentions clear, and that this passage too in its original form referred to God as the teacher of verbal conventions. See especially the following sentence, omitted from the abridgement: *tasmān mahādeva eva sanakādīn anuṣṭhāya vāyavādayo vāyavādīpadāḥ prapitpādantiyā itī svābhīprāyagocaram sāksātkāram teṣām utpādayatīty abhyupagantavyam* (Tarkasāgara 220.18–19). This illustrates strikingly the uncertainties involved in reading the abridged version, and the fact that the original intention of many passages may well have become obscured.

* Thus the edition, but text has been lost here due to eyeskip, and Thakur has emended silently. For *nāsmadādīnām yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* read *na yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyajanyaṇi parābhīprāyasya yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* with the manuscript: this agrees almost exactly with Tarkasāgara 220.12–14 (where for *[nna]* read *na*), with the sole exception that there the final compound ends in **vedyatvānabhyupagāmāt* rather than **vedyatvāsambhavāt*, a difference which does not materially affect the sense.

- 19 In taking *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*, *dāna* Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra differs from Candrānanda, who understands the word as referring to *smṛti* prescriptions of giving (*dānavidhi*). Śaṅkara Miśra tries to have things both ways; first he glosses *dadātiḥ* as *svargakāmo gām dadyād ityādaḥ yad dānapratipādanam* (257.12), but subsequently he adds *dadātīr itī dhātunirdeśo dhātvartham dānam upalakṣayati* (258.3–4). A different interpretation is followed by Vyomaśiva, who understands *dadātiḥ* as meaning the word *dadāti*: *evam vede buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ dadātīśabdah, dadātītyuktavāt, ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavai** (MS f. 193r8, Vyo¹ 581.20–22, Vyo² vol. 2 168.11–13).

* Thus the MS: *evam vede buddhipūrvō dadātīśabdo dadātītyuktavāt, ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavai* Vyo¹, *evam [(vede?) buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ vede buddhipūrvō dadātīśabdah, dadātītyuktavād ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavai* (sic) Vyo².

One must grant Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra that, first of all, Śābara too uses *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*.

And [the composition of sentences in the Veda can] not [have been produced] from the cognitions of [ordinary] people like us;⁷ [this fact is]⁸ the inferential mark of the *ṛṣi*. 6.1.2

Since it is denied that cognitions of [ordinary] people [like us] can have produced the sentences [of the Veda]⁹ the sentences of the Veda are an inferential mark for [the existence of] a cognition belonging to a person different from [and superior to] such [ordinary people like us]. And this [different person]¹⁰ is the blessed (*bhagavān*) *ṛṣi* [who in this case must be taken to be] God (*īśvara*).¹¹

The knowledge that [the word *brāhmaṇa* has been conventionally assigned by God to denote] brahmins¹² is the inferential mark of the extraordinary accomplishment/power [of certain human beings]. 6.1.3

- 7 I see no better way to make the sūtra yield tolerable sense and remain consistent with the thrust of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary than to emend the *sa vāsmadbuddhibhyo* of the MS to *na cāsmadbuddhibhyo* as in the version of Candrānanda and both the Ahmedabad and Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts (Śaṅkara Miśra does not know the sūtra). The same emendation was made by Jambūvijaya. The corruption may have been mechanical, though it cannot be explained purely on the basis of the characteristics of Malayalam script: the confusion of *na* / *sa* is likely enough, but that of *ca* / *va* rather suggests transmission in Devanāgarī or another Northern script. Thakur's conjecture *sa vā asmadbuddhibhyo*, retained by Nozawa, is unsatisfactory and, to me, unclear. I do not see what *sa* is meant to refer to; *buddhi* is feminine, and if *veda*, *krama* or even *īśvara* were meant, the compound *asmadbuddhyanya* is strange as a predicate. Furthermore, given the possibility of doing so, the ablative, which is also found in all other versions of the sūtra, should be maintained. The *vā* of the manuscript which Thakur retains also seems meaningless and suspect.
- 8 Translating as if there were an *iti* in the text. From his commentary, it seems that Candrānanda interpreted the sūtra in a very similar fashion, and indeed it is hard to see how else to take it.
- 9 The compound *asmadādibuddhivākyajanakaṛasya* is a little unnatural, but in this case I have not chosen for Thakur's—understandable—emendation, *asmadādibuddhervākyajanakaṛasya*.
- 10 The restoration *lingam* seems virtually certain, and is confirmed by the remaining traces of medial *i* on the first lost syllable. *sa ca* is also fairly convincing. I think: this would fit well in the remaining space and provides the connection to the previous sentence which one feels is required. Thakur's restoration, though providing adequate sense, is inconsistent with the *anuvāra* of *vedavākyaṃ* which is preserved (though it was apparently omitted in the transcript).
- 11 Like Candrānanda, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra takes *ṛṣi* in the sūtra as referring to God; a highly implausible interpretation.
- 12 This interpretation of *brāhmaṇasaṃjñāsiddhi* is based largely on the commentary on 2.1.18 (numbered 2.1.17 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version), where we read *saṃjñā karma viśayo 'syeti saṃjñā, iyaṃ asya saṃjñeti jñānam* (TS 219.29 ≈ V 21.16), and the commentary on 2.1.19 (2.1.18 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version), where we find *saṃjñākarma nāśvarasyābhipreteti saṃjñākarma* V 22.1). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's understanding of the term is briefly discussed by Wezler (1982b. 97).

There is [it is agreed], to start with (*asti tāvat*), an establishing of conventions (*saṃketakarāṇa*) [of using] the words 'brahmin' and so on with regard to brahmins and so on who have arisen at the beginning of creation. And [ordinary people] like us¹³ do not have knowledge of brahminhood and so on at the beginning of creation, for by mere sensory contact (*indriyasannipātamātreṇa*) [we] do not experience brahminhood and so on as differentiated from *kṣatriya*-hood and so on, and because there is no other manifesting factor [which could cause a cognition of brahminhood]. [For] in the first place, a particular kind of form is not a manifesting factor for this [brahminhood] (*atra*), because [the existence of] a particular form [of brahmins and so on which is] differentiated from [those of] *kṣatriyas* and so on is refuted by the fact that [such a form] is not perceived though it [if it existed would be] suitable [to be perceived].¹⁴ Nor is the being born from a mother and father who were already [themselves] brahmins (*brāhmaṇabhūta*) [a manifesting factor for brahminhood], because this (i.e. the being born from such parents) is not possible at the beginnings of creation.¹⁵ Nor is the being born from [atoms

- 13 My reconstruction of the lacuna here is consistent with the remaining *akṣaras* in the manuscript and the number of *akṣaras* which may be presumed to have been lost, while yielding, I believe, the correct sense. Thakur's, on the other hand, involves changing °*karaṇa* to °*karo*, does not agree with the size of the lacuna, forces him to alter the subsequent °*brāhmaṇatvādyananubhavāt* of the manuscript to °*brāhmaṇatvādyanubhavāt*, and, for all that, still does not seem to me to be satisfactory from the point of view of sense and coherence.
- 14 It is clear that this is the intended sense, and that Thakur's emendation °*viśeṣasya yogyānupalambha*° for the transmitted °*viśeṣasyāyogyānupalambha*° is correct. The attribution of the fault of *yogyānupalabdhi* is of course regularly made by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra in arguments: an instance which employs the same wording we have here is *id api na, yāgāvyavahitottarakṣaṇe svargasya yogyānupalambhanirastatvāt* (TS 3.25).
- 15 The plural in *sargādyeṣu* is perfectly understandable, since creation is a process or phase which is repeated periodically, and the reading of the manuscript has therefore been accepted. It is however not beyond suspicion, as Bhaṭṭa Vādindra usually employs the singular; cf. for instance *sargādau* at the beginning of the commentary on 6.1.3, or *sṛṣṭyādau* in the commentary on 2.1.18 (quoted in footnote 18 below).

also established that] there exist certain [extraordinary persons] who have direct knowledge—attained through His favour—of brahminhood and so on, which are beyond [the perception of] the senses for [ordinary people] like us, [and who] grasp the [verbal] conventions [created and revealed by God].

The authoritative nature of the Vedas having been [thus] established, [the *sūtra-kāra*] begins [the following sequence of *sūtras*] in order to expound the means towards *dharma* which is expounded by those [Vedic texts]:

Giving, preceded by [orthodoxly pious] cognitions [, is a means towards obtaining *dharma*]. 6.1.4

[The word] *dadāti* [which when inflected as a noun ordinarily refers to the verbal root (*dhātu*) $\sqrt{dā}$] is used [here] by secondary usage (*lakṣaṇayā*) to mean that which is designated by [that] verbal root [$\sqrt{dā}$].¹⁹ [And] ‘cognition’ [here means] orthodoxly pious cognition (*āstikyabuddhi*). Giving preceded by faith, is a means to-

with a peculiar faculty of cognition can have insight into it, and it is they who, in their turn, teach all others how to speak’ (1982b, 98). This interpretation of the commentary on 2.1.18, according to which Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra’s theory on the origin of language would differ importantly from that of Prāśastapāda and of Udayana, would contradict the reading I have restored here ad 6.1.3. However, the fuller version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra’s commentary, which was not available to Wezler, though itself corrupt, shows that the abridged version as preserved most probably does not make Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra’s full intentions clear, and that this passage too in its original form referred to God as the teacher of verbal conventions. See especially the following sentence, omitted from the abridgement; *īasmān mahādeva eva sanakādīn anuṣṭhāya vāyavādayo vāyavādayaḥ prapitṛādāniyā itī svābhīprāyagocaram sākṣātkāram teṣām utpādayatīty abhyupagantavyam* (Tarkasāgara 220.18–19). This illustrates strikingly the uncertainties involved in reading the abridged version, and the fact that the original intention of many passages may well have become obscured.

* Thus the edition, but text has been lost here due to eyeskip, and Thakur has emended silently. For *nāsmadādīnām yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* read *na yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyajanyam, parābhīprāyasya yogajadharmanirapekṣendriyavedyatvāsambhavāt* with the manuscript; this agrees almost exactly with Tarkasāgara 220.12–14 (where for [nna] read *na*), with the sole exception that there the final compound ends in °*vedyatvānabhyupagāmāt* rather than °*vedyatvāsambhavāt*, a difference which does not materially affect the sense.

- 19 In taking *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*, *dāna* Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra differs from Candrānanda, who understands the word as referring to *smṛti* prescriptions of giving (*dānavidhi*). Śaṅkara Miśra tries to have things both ways; first he glosses *dadātiḥ* as *svargakāmo gām dadyād ityādaḥ yad dānapratipādanam* (257.12), but subsequently he adds *dadātir itī dhātunirdeśo dhātvaritām dānam upalakṣayati* (258.3–4). A different interpretation is followed by Vyomaśiva, who understands *dadātiḥ* as meaning the word *dadāti*; *evam vede buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ dadātīśabdah, dadātītyuktavāt, ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavat* (MS f. 193r8, Vyo¹ 581.20–22, Vyo² vol. 2 168.11–13).

* Thus the MS; *evam vede buddhipūrvō dadātīśabdo dadātītyuktavāt, ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavat* Vyo¹, *evam [(vede?) buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ vede buddhipūrvō dadātīśabdah, dadātītyuktavād ubhayābhimatadadātīśabdavat* (sic) Vyo².

One must grant Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra that, first of all, Śābara too uses *dadātiḥ* to mean, *de facto*,

wards *dharma*; this is the [real] meaning [of the sūtra]. Giving [is defined as] relinquishing [something] for the sake of someone. And it is not the case that [this definition of giving] does not extend to²⁰ *yāga* and *homa*, for these too are [nothing but] special types of giving. [However] Jaimini and so on (i.e. the Mīmāṃsakas) [define giving differently, as follows:] giving is the relinquishing of substances (*dravya-tyāga*) for the sake of a sentient being,²¹ and they say that (*iti*) [this definition] does not undesirably over-extend to *yāga* and *homa*, because a deity is not a sentient being.²² This [Mīmāṃsaka view] is incorrect, for [despite their contention] a deity is a sentient being.

dāna (and has other similar usages; cf. footnote 21 below), and also that though it is perfectly acceptable to take *dadāti* in the sense of 'the verbal root $\sqrt{dā}$ ' or 'the expression "he gives" (*dadāti*)', to interpret it as a *vidhi*, as Candrānanda does, seems to stretch things a little. Perhaps this is why Śaṅkara Miśra chooses to use the term *dānapratipādanam*, although in the context this comes to the same as a *dānavidhi* and the example he gives indeed contains *vidhiliṅ*.

20 The sense clearly requires us to emend *ativyāpti*, an error which may have been caused by anticipation of the subsequent *ativyāpti*, to *avyāpti*. Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's point is precisely that, as he defines it, sacrifices fall under giving; only if this is so does it follow that the *sūtrakāra*'s failure to mention the former neither is a fault nor implies that sacrifices are *not* a means to acquire *dharma*.

21 This definition of giving differs from that given by Śābara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 4.2.28 (the *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* itself does not define *dāna*) in a passage which runs as follows. *atha dadātiḥ kiṃlakṣaṇaka iti | ātmanaḥ svatvavyāvṛtiḥ, parasya svatvena saṃbandhaḥ | yajati dadāti-juhotaḥ sarveṣṭisargaḥ samānaḥ | tatra yajati devatām uddiśyotsargamātram juhotaḥ āseca-nādikāḥ, dadāti utsargapūrvakāḥ parasvatvena sambandha ity eṣa eṣāṃ viśeṣa iti* (56.12–16). 'Now what is the characteristic mark of giving? That one's self is separated from ownership and another is connected with ownership. In all [three], *yajati* (~ *yāga*), *dadāti* (~ *dāna*) and among them *yajati* is simply relinquishing [a substance] for the sake of a deity.^{*} *juhotaḥ* is pouring [of e.g. ghee into a fire] and so on, and *dadāti* is the connecting with ownership of another, preceded by relinquishing; this is the difference between them.' Nor have I found the definition which Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra ascribes to the Mīmāṃsakas in any other Mīmāṃsā text. It seems however not intrinsically improbable as a Mīmāṃsaka view, and it may be just as likely that it is not quoted from a Mīmāṃsā text, but represents Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's formulation, chosen to allow easy comparison with his own standpoint. On the distinction between *yāga*, *homa* and *dāna* see also Kane 1974a, 841.

* Compare also Śābara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 7.1.5, *eṣa ca yajati, yad dravyaṃ devatām uddiśya mantreṇa tyajate*.

22 For the Mīmāṃsā a *devatā* has no independent existence. Cf. e.g. Śābara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 9.1.60, *na devatā nāma jātyā kācit | saiva kasyacid rūpasya devatā, saiva nānyasya | yasya yāni prati tādarīyaṇi, sā tasya devatā* (177.17–19). Nor does a deity have more than a subsidiary role in the sacrifice; cf. e.g. Śābara ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 8.1.32, *nanu devatāpi yāgena sambaddhā | tasmād bahiraṅgam* (19.8–10). Cf. Verpoorten 1987, 20n.101. '[i]n the M [i.e. Mīmāṃsā], the gods (*devatā*) are virtually useless. The rite is effective quite irrespective of their intervention. They have a purely verbal existence,' and further references given there.

And accepting²³ [a gift is also a means towards *dharma*]. 6.1.5

Accepting, preceded by faith,²⁴ too is a means towards *dharma*.

And these two (i.e. giving and accepting) have a [fixed temporal] order, just as [certain other] things which are not dependent the one on the other (i.e. one of which is not directly dependent on the other). 6.1.6

These two, giving and accepting, have a [fixed temporal] order, just like a donkey and a pot and so on [which have a fixed temporal order] although they do not have the relationship of effect and cause.²⁵

Because with respect to qualities of [one] soul, qualities of another soul are not a cause. 6.1.7

'Qualities of another soul' [means] qualities of another soul with the exception of God.²⁶ [Expressed in the form of a syllogism, the point made by the sūtra is:] the *dharma* [produced from] giving which is established in Devadatta is not a cause of the *dharma* [produced from] accepting [Devadatta's gift] which is established in Yajñadatta, because it is a *dharma* [belonging to] Devadatta, like that [on which we are all] agreed [that it is a *dharma* of Devadatta's, of which we also all agree that it

23 It is perhaps advisable to keep in mind that, like *dāna*, the concept of *pratigraha* is in *dharmaśāstra* a more precise one than the English rendering might suggest. Cf. e.g. Medhātithi's commentary ad *Manusmṛti* 4.5, quoted and discussed in Kane 1974a, 842.

24 Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra clearly assumes *anuvṛtti* of *buddhipūrvak* from 6.1.4.

25 The idea is perhaps that though a donkey is not reckoned as a cause of a pot, only after water has been brought by a donkey to mix with clay the pot is made. The same notion is referred to by Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra in a passage of the *Tarkasāgara* (ad VS 1.1.7) where he considers a number of possible definitions of *janakaivam*. One of these is 'the existing at a moment, before the arising of the effect, which is not distant [from the moment in which the effect is produced],' which is rejected because on such a definition it would follow that a donkey and the like would also be 'producers' of a pot. Even if one adds the qualification that the producer should necessarily exist at an earlier, not distant, moment, the same consequence is entailed: *nāpy avyavahitapūrvakṣaṇavṛttivam, ghaṭādyavyavahitapūrvakṣaṇavṛttinām rāsabhādīnām api ghaṭādikāraṇavaprasaṅgāt | nāpi niyamenāvyavahitapūrvakṣaṇavṛttivam, niyamena tadghatapūrvakṣaṇavṛttinām rāsabhādīnām etadghatajanakaivaprasaṅgāt* (TS 71.23–25).

26 God, who is a kind of soul, is omnipotent, and his qualities such as knowledge and effort or will (*prayatna*) are reckoned as instrumental causes in respect to everything; cf. for instance Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra's comments on VS 1.1.18 (as numbered in Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*: 1.1.19 in his edition of the abridged version), where he writes *yathā dravyam dravyaguṇakarmaṇām sādharmaṇām kāraṇam, tathā guṇo 'pi, tīśvarajñānecchāprayatnadharmādharmair dravyaguṇakarmajanānāt* (TS 121.8–9; the corresponding passage in the short version, 9.17–18, omits *sādhāraṇam* and wrongly reads °*dharmādharmāder* which must presumably be corrected either to °*dharmādharmādyair* or °*dharmādharmair*).

is not a cause of *dharma* in Yajñadatta].²⁷ Therefore, just as there is no proof (*pramāṇa*)²⁸ that giving and accepting [and the *dharma*s produced by these] are related as cause and effect, there is also an [argument] which refutes [this possibility]; this is what is taught [in this sūtra].

[If this is the case], how [is it] then [possible that] delight residing in Yajñadatta is produced by the *dharma* residing in Yajñadatta's son [which is produced from the performance of] *śrāddha* [rites, which, by our definition above also fall under giving]? [Since this question is asked, the *sūtrakāra*] therefore says:

Prosperity²⁹ [arises] from the association [which arises] from feeding
[a brahmin who is] good. 6.1.8

'From feeding a good' brahmin' [i.e., in fact] from the blessing 'May your ancestors be happy' which is pronounced by a good brahmin who is satisfied [by the food

27 The *drṣṭānta* in this syllogism, *sampratipannavat*, may be a little puzzling at first, but seems to be typical of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's style. Rather than representing a specific example of an entity which possesses both *hetu* and *sādhya*dharma, it is no doubt to be interpreted as 'like any entity on which all parties are agreed (*sampratipanna*, in obvious contrast to *vipratipanna*) that it possesses the *hetu*, all of which are also such that all parties admit that they possess the *sādhya*-*dharma* as well.'

Another, relatively clear, example of this usage from other works of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is *ātmā sukhavarūpaḥ, parapremāspadavāt, sampratipannavat* (DKT 625.25–26). A case to be noted is found at Tarkasāgara 39.11–12, *vedavākyaṃ pramāṇam tīvaravākyaivāt, sampratipanna-tadvākyaivāt*. This is no doubt the fuller form, of which *sampratipannavat* is an abbreviation, and could be based on the type of formulation we occasionally find in Vyomaśiva's writing, of which the following is an example; *anityāni vedavākyaṇi, vākyaivāt, ubhayābhimatavākyaivāt* (Vyo² vol. 2 168.7–8, MS f. 193r6–7); cf. also footnote 19 on page 83 above. In our case, the *sampratipannavat* is to be interpreted as standing for *sampratipannataddharmavat* or *sampratipannadevadattadharmavat*.

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's usage is not unique though; the same abbreviation is met with regularly in the *Mānamanohara* of Vādivāgīśvara (writing probably a little before Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's time). cf. e.g. *vimataṃ jñānūmakam, vastutvāt, satvāt, sampratipannavaditi* (8.5–6). A later author who uses the same phrase is Sarvadeva (fl. ca. A.D. 1650), in whose *Pramāṇamañjarī* we regularly find syllogisms such as the following: *vipratipannaṃ sarvaṃ kāryaṃ dikkālakāryam, kāryavāt, sampratipannavat* (33.23–24).

28 The emendation *pramāṇābhāvavāt* for the *pramāṇābhāvavāt* of the MS yields better sense than the alternative emendation *pramāṇābhāvāt* chosen by Thakur. Compare the somewhat similar *na kevalaṃ sādhanarahitam, bādhitam cety āha* (DKT 619.3). The mere absence of a proof is not in itself something which refutes a possibility or renders it impossible. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes rather to say that *in addition to* the absence of any proof that giving and accepting (and the *dharma* which these two activities engender) are related as cause and effect, there is also an argument which refutes such a theory, namely that given in the sūtra: qualities of one human soul cannot be a cause of qualities in another soul.

29 I adopt this translation for *abhyudaya*, though it is not a very satisfactory one, from Halbfass (e.g. 1991, 72).

given him after the *śrāddha*], happiness arises [for the deceased ancestors of the person who has performed the rites and fed the brahmin].

This³⁰ does not exist (i.e. occur) when a bad [brahmin] is fed. 6.1.9

‘This’ [i.e.] the cause of prosperity [namely the blessing of a good brahmin] does not arise when a bad [brahmin] is fed.

[One should know a brahmin to be] bad when [he engages] in violence.³¹ 6.1.10

[The words] ‘know’ [and] ‘engaged in’ are to be supplied. ‘In violence’ is a partial designation (*upalakṣaṇa*) which includes the theft of gold and so on. When a bad [brahmin] is fed only a fault, not prosperity, arises.

This (i.e. the engaging in violence and so on?) does not occur in a good [brahmin].³² 6.1.11

With regard to a superior [brahmin] action [is to be performed].³³ 6.1.12

- 30 The omission of *tad* in the manuscript is no doubt due to scribal error, and was already corrected by Thakur. All other versions of the sūtra have the word, and the commentary clearly presupposes it.
- 31 It is worth noting that all our commentaries supply a finite verb in their interpretation of the sūtra and take *duṣṭam* as a masculine accusative. This hardly inspires confidence, and one cannot but be inclined rather to suppose that the word was originally intended as a neuter nominative.
- 32 No commentary on this sūtra has been preserved, so that it is unfortunately not possible to say how Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra interpreted *tat*. In looking for guidance to other commentators we are confronted with the problem that their reading of the passage is significantly different: both Candrānanda and Śaṅkara Miśra read another sūtra before this one which, if accepted, could significantly affect the sense. In Candrānanda’s text this runs *samabhivṛyāhārato doṣaḥ* and in Śaṅkara Miśra’s *tasya samabhivṛyāhārato doṣaḥ*. Candrānanda comments on his version with *kṛtamahāpātakasya sambhāṣaṇamātrād eva doṣeṇa yuyate, kim uta bhojanādīnā iha samabhivṛyāhāraḥ sambhāṣaṇam, pūrvatra* (i.e. in C 6.1.8) *āśtrvāda*, and coming to the sūtra we are now dealing with, which he knows in the same reading as Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra, he comments *tat samabhivṛyāhārādūṣaṇam hiṃsādirahite brāhmaṇe na vidyate*. This reading and interpretation is suspicious on more than one count: aside from the problem of the meaning of *samabhivṛyāhāra* the gender of *tat* is obviously a difficulty. Śaṅkara Miśra also wishes to refer *tat* back to *doṣaḥ* in the previous sūtra: he prepares the way for this by glossing *doṣaḥ* there already with *pāpam*, and then can say here *tat pāpam*. . . (262.7–9). If Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra indeed did not know the preceding sūtra with *doṣaḥ*, I presume that he would have taken *tat* not as referring to the fault which arises in one who converses with or feeds a ‘bad’ brahmin but to the faults of *hiṃsā* and so on themselves. This incidentally seems to make the locative + *vidyate* construction more natural: the problem that remains is that in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra’s understanding (and, as noted in the previous footnote, that of the other commentators) *duṣṭa* in 6.1.10 is not a neuter noun which could be directly picked up by *tat*, but a masculine accusative.
- 33 This sūtra has strangely enough been omitted in Thakur’s edition, though it is present in the

With regard to [a brahmin who is] more virtuous than oneself, activity should be undertaken in order to give [to him].

In the same way 'relinquishing' of opposing [people].³⁴ 6.1.13

Like giving and so on, the 'relinquishing' [which is here an euphemistic expression meaning] slaying of opposing [people] and of attackers³⁵ is also a means towards *dharma*.

With regard to a [person who is] equal [in merit] 'relinquishing' oneself or 'relinquishing' the other. 6.1.14

With regard to a superior [person who attacks one] 'relinquishing' oneself. 6.1.15

This [latter sūtra]³⁶ means that (*iti*) one should not slay an attacker who is eminent.

Thus the first *āhnika* of the sixth *adhyāya*.

manuscript and followed by a dot; this is perhaps due to a *lapsus oculi* of the transcriber, though there is no obvious homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton which could have provoked it. Nozawa also does not admit it into Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*, although Jambūvijaya had already correctly seen that it is clearly presupposed by the following commentary.

- 34 Before this other versions have two additional sūtras which run, in Candrānanda's text (the variants of other recensions may be ignored here), *same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ* 6.1.14, *etena hīnasamavi-*
śiṣṭadhārmikebhyah parādānaṃ vyākhyātam 6.1.15. Though it is not impossible that the sūtras were omitted due to error in transmission, the way in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands *tathā* in this sūtra suggests that he did not know the second of them, at least; had he done so, one would expect the *tathā* to be explained with some reference to the preceding *etena... vyākhyātam*.
- 35 On *āyatāyin* cf. Kane 1973, 517–518.
- 36 No commentary on 6.1.14 has been preserved.

Adhyāya 6, āhnikā 2

[Because of the non-existence] of visible goals, the employment of visible [means] leads to exaltation: [this is known through the Veda,] there being no[thing] visible [of the results such as the being born in heaven].¹ 6.2.1

Supply '[this] is known through the Veda.' Supply 'because of the non-existence' to 'of visible goals.' To 'there being no[thing] visible' supply 'of the being born in heaven and so on.'² 'Employment' [means] abandoning accompanied by the

1 It will hardly surprise anyone that this interpretation, based on the fairly explicit directions given in the commentary, is not the one advocated by others who have dealt with the sūtra. But there is indeed a certain difficulty with the word *dr̥ṣṭānām*, which Candrānanda solves in a way which also does not immediately inspire confidence, glossing *śrutismṛtiparidr̥ṣṭānām*. Śaṅkara Miśra has a different reading, with *dr̥ṣṭādr̥ṣṭaprayojanānām* for *dr̥ṣṭānām* *dr̥ṣṭaprayojanānām* and with *prayojanam* for *prayogo*, but in this he is both alone and inconsistent, for in the reprise as 10.2.20 he does have the readings attested by all other versions at both places (cf. already Faddegon 1918, 348).

2 It is, I believe, Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's intention to stress that the heavenly reward of gifts to brahmins (and indeed of Vedic sacrifice) is not seen, i.e. not known by direct perceptual cognition (understanding this from *dr̥ṣṭābhāve*), but is known (as indeed coming to be) on the authority of the Veda, and by no other means. That ordinary people, at least, know of heaven only through scripture is a common Nyāya position, taught already (by implication at least) in the Nyāya-bhāṣya: *laukikasya svarge na liṅgadarśanam na pratyakṣam* NBh² 182.25. This is of course also a good Mīmāṃsaka view; cf. e.g. the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*'s *yasya yadarthatvaṃ pramāṇāntareṇāprāptam tasya tadarthatvena yo vidhiḥ so 'pūrvavidhiḥ, yathā yajeta svargakāma ityādiḥ | yāgasya hi svargārthatvaṃ na pramāṇāntareṇa prāptam kiṃ tv anenaiva vidhineti bhavaty ayam apūrvavidhiḥ* (245.18–22 §242), which Edgerton translates 'An injunction which sets forth as having a useful purpose something the usefulness of which for that purpose is not established by other modes-of-evidence, is a 'new' (absolute, *apūrvā*) injunction. As, "Who desires heaven shall sacrifice" and the like. For the fact that sacrifice is useful for gaining heaven is not established by any other mode-of-evidence, but by this very injunction alone: so it is a new injunction' (1929, 135).

This question of how we know that Vedic ritual indeed will lead to heaven also comes up in the opening (*trisūtrīyākhyā*) section of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's VS commentary, with the full version of the commentary naturally having a much longer (and more complicated) discussion which I cannot hope to do justice to here. Basically, our author's standpoint, if I understand him aright, is that the Veda is authoritative as to what must be performed and as to what the ultimate result thereof is, but not with regard to the *dharma* which plays the most important part in this process, for that, says Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra, can be known only through *anumāna*, which in turn is to be learned from the Vaiśeṣika; see *nanu yadi na dharme vedasya prāmāṇyam kva tarhi svargakāmo yajetety asya prāmāṇyam | dharmasādhye svarge tatsādhane" ca yāge | tathā ca prastāpādāḥ—tasya tu sādhanāni śrutismṛtivyūhātītyādi* (PDhS 272.11–12) | *kaḥ punar svargakāmo yajetety asyārthatḥ | svargakāmo yāgaṃ kuryād iti | nanu yadi na yāgaḥ svargasādhanaṃ kimarthatḥ tarhi svargakāmena kriyate | svargoṭpādakadharmārthatḥ ity avaihi | svargoṭpādako yāgajanyo dharmah punar vaiśeṣikaśāstravyūpādītānumānasamādhigamya eveti* (TS

naming of a brahmin and so on [as recipient]. And thus what is meant [is in effect that] (*iti*) the abandoning of visible [means] such as gold, firewood, ghee, boiled rice (*caru*) and rice-cake (*puroḍāś*) accompanied by the naming of a brahmin and so on [as recipient] is known through the Veda as a means towards the *dharma* that is a means towards [the attaining of] heaven.³

[The observance of] restrictions with regard to ablution, fasting, chaste conduct, living in the house of one's guru, wandering from forest to forest,⁴ sacrifice, giving, sprinkling [of water or melted butter],⁵ direction, lunar mansion, mantra and time⁶ [: all these lead to] [the production of] the *adr̥ṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma*). 6.2.2

The word 'restriction' is [to be] taken with each⁷ [prior member of the compound, so that one should understand] 'restriction [with regard to] ablution,' 'restriction [with regard to] fasting,' 'restriction [with regard to] chaste conduct' and so on.

7.27–8.2: cf. in the abridged version 1.22–25).

* °*sādhane*: em. (in accordance with the abridged version, 1.23), °*sādhakena* Thakur.

- 3 As may be seen from the apparatus to the edition, the commentary has been mangled to no little extent in Thakur's edition. The loss of text due to eyeskip is understandable, and doubtless goes back to the transcript, but how and why the perfectly clear and natural *prayogo* was changed to *evam sati go* I cannot say, though Thakur's use of brackets may indicate a conjecture.
- 4 Translating slightly freely but in general accordance with the commentary, on which see footnote 11 on p. 91 below. The commentary also is the basis for my emendation of the manuscript's °*vānaprastha*°, retained by Thakur, to °*vānaprasthya*°; see footnote 12 on p. 91 below.
- 5 There is nothing in the commentary as we have it to show what particular ritual Bhaṭṭa Vādindra understood this as referring to. Candrānanda glosses *prokṣaṇa* in this sūtra with *sandhyopāsana*di, whereas Śaṅkara Miśra explains it with *vṛhīn prokṣatītyādividhividheyam* (270.10). On the noun *prokṣaṇa* see in the first place Kiehnle 1979, 8–9 (§10): in four of the five Vedic passages found and discussed by Kiehnle it appears to denote that which is used to sprinkle with (note e.g. *ghṛtām prokṣaṇam bhavati* at *Maitrāyaṇīsaṃhitā* 2.1.5 and *ājyam prokṣaṇam* at *Taittirīyasaṃhitā* 2.2.10.2) and is rendered by her as 'Vorspritzmittel.' Only in the occurrence in *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* 1.1.3.10 (with reprises at 3.5.4.17, 3.6.1.11, 3.7.1.4 and 3.7.4.3) does Kiehnle consider it possible that the word should be rendered as 'Vorspritzen.' The preceding and following members of the compound in our sūtra render it highly probable that it is here used in the latter sense, as understood by Candrānanda and Śaṅkara Miśra.
- 6 This rendering of the compound in accordance with Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's directions is not the only possibility nor the most plausible one. Candrānanda takes *niyama* only with the preceding members from *dik* on, and this seems logical because the others all denote activities and thus make good sense in the context without the addition of *niyama* while it is less clear that *dik* and so on can similarly stand alone. Śaṅkara Miśra however takes the entire compound as a dvandva, and it is this interpretation that is followed not only by Faddegon (1918, 248–349), whose discussion of the sūtra is still well worth reading, but more recently by Honda in his English translation (1990, 121(52)–120(53)).
- 7 Here the context allowed Thakur to restore the lacuna in the manuscript in a most convincing fashion.

The restriction [with regard to] ablution [is expressed by the injunction] 'one should bath at dawn,' the restriction [with regard to] fasting' [is expressed by the injunction] 'one should fast on the eleventh day [of both *pakṣas* of each month]'⁸ and so on.⁹ The guru [meant here is] God, who is everyone's teacher [with regard to what] *dharma* [is].¹⁰ A 'forest-goer' [is so-called] because (*iti*) he sets out from [one] forest to [another] forest; [the word should] not however [be taken here to mean] someone in the third stage of life.¹¹ 'Going [from forest to] forest' [means then here] the activity of this [type of person].¹²

- 8 The famous day(s) of fast, on which I may here suffice with referring to Kane 1974b, 95–121. *ekādaśyām* has been lost in the manuscript and restored by Thakur; an emendation in which I have full confidence.
- 9 The injunctions are doubtless from *smṛti*; it would probably not be difficult to find *smṛti* passages which could be similarly cited as authorities for the other restrictions Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra understands as being taught here to produce *dharma*.
- 10 Presumably this interpretation may be taken as implying that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra wishes to understand *gurukulavāsa* as referring to visiting temples.
- 11 Thakur's *sa tu tṛītyāśramī* for the *na tu tṛītyāśramī* of the manuscript may have originated in a misreading by the transcriber, for *sa* and *na* are easily confused in Malayalam script. The manuscript reading is clearly correct, for several reasons. First, and weakest, with *sa* the particle *tu* would be slightly suspicious, as there would neither be a clear contrast nor a change of subject. Secondly, it seems that with his *vanād vanam pratiṣṭhata iti* Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra is distancing himself from explanations of the type given by Candrānanda (ad loc.), who explains *vānaprasthīya* with the words *śāstravidhinā gehān niḥsṛtyāranyam prasthito vānaprasthah ta-sya karma vānaprasthyam*. In view of this clear disagreement it would be strange to find Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra after all agreeing in taking the word to refer to the activities of someone in the third *āśrama*. Finally, it would be inconsistent for him to do so, for it is evident that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's explanation of *gurukulavāsa* in this sūtra is also a forced attempt to interpret the word as not referring to a practice specifically characteristic of an *āśrama*, in this case the first (contrast Praśastapāda's *āśramiṇāṃ tu brahmacārīṇo gurukulanivāsinaḥ svaśāstravivṛitāni guruśuśrūṣāgnānābhaikṣyācaraṇāni madhumāṃsādivāsvapnāñjanābhyañjanādivarjanam ca* PDhS 272.22–273.1). The motivation for Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra to thus twist the sense of both items is not made explicit, but may I think be safely assumed to be that he wished to avoid any overlap between the contents of this list and the following sūtra, where I presume that he understood *cāturāśramyam* as meaning 'the different activities specifically belonging to (or prescribed for) people in the four stages of life' (cf. also footnote 13 below). We have no comment here on *brahmacarya* but that item would have presented no problems to our commentator, who might for example have explained that the chaste behaviour meant here is not that associated specially with the stage of a religious student but that enjoined for householders outside of the strictly regulated periods during which cohabitation is prescribed.
- 12 Chiefly on the strength of this passage, I have read °*vānaprasthīya*° in the sūtra. This is not so much because of the way the word is transmitted here—the manuscript has the rather amusing error *vānaspatyam*, and one might say that the *ṛya* supports °*prasthīya* to some degree—but because it appears to me most likely that there is an implicit reference here to Aṣṭādhyāyī 5.1.124, *guṇavacanabrahmarāḍibhyaḥ karmaṇi ca*. This teaches that the suffix *ṣyaṆ* (cf. 5.1.123) applied to words expressing properties/qualities and to *brāhmaṇa* and so on, can denote not merely the sense of 'being x' (cf. 5.1.119) but also a person's activity; and the Pāṇinian tradition is vir-

[And the activities specifically belonging to] the four stages of life.¹³

‘[Lead] to [the production of] *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma*)’ is still valid.

And bad and good purposes.¹⁴ 6.2.4

The construction [here too is with] the word ‘[leads] to [the production of] *adṛṣṭa* (i.e. in this case *dharma* or *adharma*)’. Bad purpose is a means toward *adharma* and good purpose a means toward *dharma*.

A bad purpose is a fault of [one’s] mental state. 6.2.5

‘Mental state’ [means] intention. Thereby (i.e. with this sūtra being read in this way) the definition [is formulated]: a bad purpose is a bad (*duṣṭa*) intention.

A good purpose is a non-fault [of one’s mental state].¹⁵ 6.2.6

[This sūtra also gives a] definition: a good purpose is a non-faulty intention.

[That which] has approved¹⁶ colour, taste, smell and touch,¹⁷ has been sprinkled [with water together with the use of mantras] and sprinkled

usually unanimous in taking *brāhmaṇādi* to be an *ākṛigāṇa* (cf. Birwé 1961, 10). This is the only rule that it seems possible that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has in mind, so that I think we may be confident that the restoration of the word *vānaprasthīya* both here and in the sūtra is correct.

- 13 I presume that this is how Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra understands the content of the word *cāturāśramyam*, partly because of his attempt to interpret *gurukulavāsa* and *vānaprasthīya* in 6.2.2 so as not to refer to the behaviour associated specifically with individual *āśramas* (cf. footnote 11 above). It is also a quite natural understanding, and is at least indirectly supported. I think, by the structure of Praśastapāda’s discussion of the means to *dharma*, Candrānanda’s *yad idaṃ caturṇām āśramiṇāṃ karma...* suggests that his interpretation is also the same. Śaṅkara Miśra tries to deal with the apparent overlap with 6.2.2 by explaining *cāturāśramyam* with the words *caturṇām āśramāṇāṃ samānam yad dharmasādhanaṃ tai tāvai pūrvasūtreṇaivoktam iti śeṣaḥ* (271.7–8).
- 14 I regret having no better translations than these for *upadhā* and *anupadhā*; at least they are in accordance with the explanations given in the following two sūtras and their commentary. Compare also Praśastapāda’s explanation of *upadhā* as *paravañcanecchā* (PDhS 261.14). Other translations which have been given, such as Honda’s ‘fraud’ and ‘non-fraud’ (1990, 120(53)) seem no better.

- 15 Another unhappy eyeskip has caused this sūtra and its commentary to be omitted in Thakur’s edition.

- 16 In the present context it would be misleading I think to translate *iṣṭa* as ‘desired.’ Note that Śaṅkara Miśra, who alone of the commentators glosses the word, says *iṣṭam śrutyā smṛtyā ca yad rūpādikaṃ vihitam yasya dravyasya tai tathā* (272.6–7).

- 17 Thakur adds *yat* before *iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam* but this is probably only because such is Śaṅkara Miśra’s reading. Candrānanda has no relative pronoun in his text, and nor do the independent *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts.

[with water alone]:¹⁸ that [food] is pure. 6.2.7

That in which there is colour, taste, smell and touch that is approved is '[that which] has approved colour, taste, smell and touch.'¹⁹ 'Sprinkled over' [means] sprinkled with water together with [the recitation of] mantras. 'And sprinkled [with water alone].' 'That' refers to food and so on, which [immediately] comes to mind [on reading the sūtra].²⁰ Food and so on²¹ of this kind is a means to *dharma*; this is the meaning [of the sūtra].

Impure is the negation of pure.²² 6.2.8

And another [type of] thing [is also impure]. 6.2.9

[Anything]²³ touched by a *caṇḍāla* or other [outcaste] is impure: this is the meaning of the second sūtra.

There is no exaltation through eating pure [food] for someone who is not self-restrained. 6.2.10

- 18 Though Bhaṭṭa Vādindra does not make clear how exactly he understands *abhyukṣita*, as he does with *prokṣita*, and what the distinction is, I think it safe to assume that he would be in agreement here with Candrānanda (*mantrapūrvakam prokṣitam, kevalādbhir abhyukṣitam* ca 49.8–9) and Śaṅkara Miśra (*prokṣitam mantrapradakṣitam, abhyukṣitam vinā mantram udakasiktam* 272.8–10).
- 19 Instead of Thakur's emendation *tad iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam* for the curious *draṣṭarūpaṃ* of the manuscript, one could also read simply *iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam*; in any case the error is somewhat difficult to account for.
- 20 A slightly free, though clumsy, translation of *tad iti buddhisthānnādeḥ parāmarśaḥ*, but hopefully one which succeeds in conveying Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's intention. The preceding sūtras have not spoken specifically of food and so on, but the *tat* refers to them, and it is not to be reckoned as a fault that this is not made explicit in the sūtra, because they are already 'present in the mind,' i.e. the opening words of the sūtra already cause one to think of them. For the idiom compare e.g. *nanu yady api pramitiḥ prastutā tathāpi pramityā pramāṇaviśeṣo 'pi buddhistha iti kiṃ ta-sya lakṣaṇam* (GK 103.18–19), which one might translate roughly 'Objection: even though [it is] valid cognition [that is] under discussion, still, through [mentioning or considering] valid cognition, [the question of some] particular means of valid cognition [that produces the valid cognition] also comes to mind, so [you should now explain] what is the definition/defining characteristic of that?'
- 21 The emendation *annādi dharmasādhanam* for the *annābhi(dha)rmasādhanam* of the manuscript is not only more economical than *annam api dharmasādhanam* as Thakur reads, but also accords with the previous *buddhisthānnādeḥ*.
- 22 We have no commentary on this sūtra, but it is most naturally taken to mean that food and so on which do not fulfil the specifications of 6.2.7 are not pure. Thus Śaṅkara Miśra: *yad dravyam śuci tadviparītam aśucīty arthaḥ | apraśastarūparasagandhasparśam amantraproṁkṣitam anabhyukṣitam, niṣiddhajalābhyukṣitam vā, anyāyāgataṃ kṛṣivāṇijyāgataṃ brāhmaṇasya dravyam aśucīty arthaḥ* (273.4–7). Here the *anyāyāgataṃ* and so on reflects the fact that in the preceding sūtra Śaṅkara Miśra read the *ca* as implying an additional condition: *cakārānnyāyato labdham* (272.10).
- 23 It would also be possible to supply as subject '[Food and so on].'

'Not self-restrained' [means] devoid of self-restraint.

And because there is no [exaltation] when there is no [eating of pure food, both self-restraint and eating of pure food must be necessary for the production of the *dharma* that leads to birth in heaven and so on].²⁴ 6.2.11

Because a special *dharma* (i.e. that which causes one to be reborn in heaven and so on) does not arise through self-restraint when there is no eating of pure [food] [it is established that] both (i.e. self-restraint and eating pure food) are [equally] a [necessary] cause for [the producing of this] special *dharma*.

Desire²⁵ [arises] from pleasure. 6.2.12

While it is being experienced, pleasure produces desire for other pleasure of the same kind. [And] that [desire] too [produces a desire] for the means towards that [other pleasure of the same kind], through the rule that whoever desires a thing also desires the means towards the same thing.

No, because satisfaction [opposes this].²⁶ 6.2.13

- 24 Before this Candrānanda reads another sūtra, *vidyate cānarīhāntaratvād yamasya*, which also has counterparts in the other recensions. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary seems to me however to strongly suggest that he did not know such a sūtra, as it refers back directly to 6.2.10. His reading of 6.2.11 is not particularly convincing however, doing little with the *ca* for example. It must be said though that none of our sources has a completely satisfactory text or interpretation of the sūtras here. I refrain from attempting to discuss the problems in detail here; some remarks may be found in Part 3, apropos of the unique readings which the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript has in this passage (p. 284ff.).
- 25 It may be worth recalling that *rāga* is, at least from Praśastapāda onwards, not a separate type of quality but a particular sub-class of the quality *icchā*; cf. *kāmo 'bhilāṣo rāgaḥ saṃkalpaḥ kārūṇyam vairāgyam upadhā bhāva ityevamādaya icchābhedāḥ* (PDhS 261.8–10). In itself, *icchā* is not necessarily bad, as the presence of *kārūṇya* and *vairāgya* in this list indicate, and it is often considered (by Udayana and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra for instance) to be a quality of God. Praśastapāda briefly defines *rāga* as *punaḥ punar viṣayānurañjanecchā* (261.11). One may however well doubt whether this sub-classification of *icchā* goes back to the earliest periods. Note that the only occurrences of the word *rāga* in the VS are in this sūtra and in 6.2.16 below; it would not be implausible to suspect that this terminology should be taken as an indication of influence from other currents of Indian thought, i.e. the 'Yoga' school (cf. especially *Yogasūtra* 2.6–7) and/or Buddhism.
- 26 Though not clearly marked as such by an introductory remark—perhaps because the *na* was felt to be clear enough an indication—this sūtra seems to be interpreted as an objection by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra. A not unjustified doubt is raised which is supposed to be answered by the following sūtra. Note that it is only in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha* that the word *na* is found; the other recensions that have an equivalent—Śaṅkara Miśra and the Trivandrum manuscript do not—reading merely *irpīṭeḥ*. Candrānanda has a correspondingly different interpretation, taking the

Supply 'because' [satisfaction] 'opposes [this].' The experience of pleasure [as a result of] eating does not produce activity towards eating again, because [only when] qualified by the absence of an opposing [factor] does it produce [such] activity. If the experiencing of pleasure is the cause of desire there would be no desire on the part of a newly born [baby] for suckling at the breast and so on,²⁷ for it has no experience of pleasure [before suckling at the breast for the first time].

Therefore [, since the explanation of 6.2.12 does not explain how desire arises in all cases, the *sūtrakāra*] says—

And through *adr̥ṣṭa*. 6.2.14

A newly born person's remembrance of pleasure experienced in a previous life, which is produced from²⁸ a mental trace and [a particular] *adr̥ṣṭa* is the cause of desire.

ablative as indicating yet another cause of *rāga*: *yadā tṛpto bhavati tadāsyā tṛptinimitto rāgo bhavati śarīrapuṣṭeḥ* (50.11).

One might wonder whether the *na* really belongs to the *sūtra* in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's version either. I am not quite certain on this point, but have decided to follow Thakur's decision, not merely because the manuscript places a small dot before the *na*, but also because I see no parallel for Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra introducing any *sūtra*, let alone one which forms a *pūrvapakṣa* and not an answer to one, with merely the word *na*.

Several other recensions—that of Candrānanda, Śaṃkara Miśra and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript—read a *sūtra tanmayatvāt* (*tanmayatvāc ca* Śaṃkara Miśra) before this. From Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's commentary below, however, it seems that the omission is not an accident of transmission or abridgement.

27 One might consider emending *stanyapānādau* for *stanapānādau* as in the manuscript, arguing that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra is likely to have had *Nvāyasūtra* 3.1.21 (3.1.20 in Ruben's text) in his mind, where an argument for the existence of an eternal soul is given in the words *pretyāhārābhyāsakṛtāḥ stanyābhlāṣāt*, on which Pakṣilasvāmin begins by remarking *jātamātrasya vatsasya pravṛttiliṅgaḥ stanyābhlāṣo gṛhyate* (NBh 746.1; see also the sub-commentators on this passage). However the same phenomenon is referred to at some other places in the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's VS commentary, and it seems that *stanapāna* is the expression our author prefers; see TS 17.21, 17.22 and 18.26. In the case of one reference the text has been transmitted in a somewhat corrupt state: Thakur prints *na hi yathā balā[?] svagatastanyanapānādi-pravṛtṭijanyeṣṭasādhana janyecchājanyaprayamapūrvakatvam anvaṇavyatirekābhyām avagacchanti, tathā pravṛtṭiṣayagocareṣābhiprāyājñānapūrvakatvam api* (TS 16.17–19); here the *balā* which seems to have puzzled Thakur should obviously be corrected to *bālāḥ* and ° *stanyanapānādi*° probably (though perhaps not necessarily) to ° *stanapānādi*°.

28 It is with confidence that I emend *jātarāgakāraṇam* as in the manuscript to *jātaṃ rāgakāraṇam*. The manuscript reading is suspicious both because of the 'hanging' *saṃskārādr̥ṣṭābhyām* which would be untypical and because *jāta* is virtually senseless as a qualification of *rāga*. It is true that unlike *saṃskāra*, *adr̥ṣṭa* is not explicitly mentioned as a cause of *smṛti* in the VS (cf. C's 9.22 *ātmanasoh saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛti*), but note that the PDhS explains the arising of *smṛti* with the words *lingadarśanecchānusmaraṇādyapekṣād ātmamanasoh saṃyogaviśeṣāt paṭvabhyāsādarapratyayajaniṭāc ca saṃskārād dr̥ṣṭāśrūṭānubhūteṣv artheṣu śeṣānuvayaśāyecchānusmaraṇadveśahetur alitaviśayā smṛtir iti* (256.17–20). Here, first of all, the ° *ādi*° in the first compound allows the admission of other factors, and there is no

By (i.e. in analogy with) this (i.e. desire) aversion is explained [as arising from suffering or from a memory which is produced from mental traces and *adr̥ṣṭa*].²⁹ 6.2.15

This [sūtra] is explained [merely by] saying [it].³⁰

If desire and aversion [arise] from *adr̥ṣṭa* how then [does] a particular desire (i.e. one specific to a certain type of beings)³¹ [arise], [in that] a man desires [cooked] food and so on, and a horse and so on grass and so on? Therefore [, since this doubt may arise,] [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

And a particular desire [of a particular type of being arises] from a particular birth. 6.2.16

From the word 'and' [one is to understand also that] a particular aversion [too arises] from a particular birth. For by [observing] positive and negative concomitance it may be determined that a particular birth too³² is a cause of this (i.e. [a particular]

reason why *Prāśastapāda* or any other *Vaiśeṣika* would object to *adr̥ṣṭa* being said to play a role. Indeed, the commentators Śrīdhara (at *Nyāyakandalī* 599.16) and Udayana (*Kiraṇāvalī* 243.15) both explicitly understand *Prāśastapāda* as referring to the factors mentioned in *Nyāyasūtra* 3.2.41: *prañidhānanibandhābhyāsalingalakṣaṇasādṛśyaparigrahaśrayāśrīasam-yārthitvakriyārāgadharmādharmanimitebhyaḥ* (scil. *smaraṇam*). For Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, at any rate, *adr̥ṣṭa* is an additional instrumental cause of everything: at one point in the *Tarkasāgara* we find as an argument *īśvaraḥ śāśvādīnām ca sarvatra nimittakāraṇatvāt* (TS 145.13). It is incidentally a noteworthy feature of *Prāśastapāda*'s account of *smṛti* that *anusmaraṇa* is one of the causal factors said to be involved in its production, though the PDhS nowhere makes explicit how *anusmaraṇa* precisely differs from *smṛti* (it is presumably a process rather than a cognition), what ontological status it has and what its causes are.

29 It might come as a surprise that this sūtra is found only in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *sūtrapāṭha*. Perhaps this should serve as a warning how easy it is to add a sūtra of this structure (*etena... vyākhyātaḥ/vyākhyātam* etc.) discretely: it would be a worthwhile project to examine all such sūtras with special care to determine if, as I suspect, some of them may be reasonably taken to be later additions.

30 I.e. is immediately clear with no need of further explanation. The same phrase is used by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra ad 3.2.5 (40.13); of course he is not the first to have coined it. Cf. for instance Aparārka ad *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* 3.8–10.

31 It would also be possible to translate *rāgaviśeṣa* 'a difference in/of desire,' but this would almost require that 'viśeṣa' in the compounds which occur subsequently should be similarly treated, and I do not find the result of this quite convincing. Note that Candrānanda did not take these compounds in that way, for he explains the sūtra *yathā tīrascāṇi tṛṇādibhojane, evaṃ jātiviśeṣād api rāgaḥ* (50.17); the construction with *yathā... evaṃ* suggests incidentally that he understood *jāti* in the sūtra as referring primarily to human *jātis*.

32 One's first impression might well be that the *api* is *bhinnakrama*, but it does make good sense here if we remember that aversion is normally not taught to arise from 'a particular birth': cf. 6.2.15 above and *Prāśastapāda*'s *sa* (scil. *dveṣaḥ*) *cātmamanasoḥ saṃyogād duḥkhāpekṣā: smṛtyapekṣād votpadyate* (PDhS 262.16–17). What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra observes here clearly applies only to a limited number of cases.

aversion).

Activity towards *dharma* and *adharma* is preceded by (i.e. influenced and caused by) desire (*icchā*)³³ and aversion.³⁴ 6.2.17

From that conjunction. 6.2.18

From the *dharma* and *adharma* produced by desire and aversion³⁵ [arise] the bonds³⁶ of *apūrva*.³⁷ and of a body and so on.

And disjunction (i.e. liberation). 6.2.19

Supply '[arises] from the destruction of *dharma* and *adharma*.'

- 33 As *icchā* occurs only once in this *adhyāya*. I have thought it not too great a drawback that the translation used is identical with that for *rāga* (incidentally, Potter 1977 also appears to regularly use 'desire' to translate both words). The difference in terminology may well be significant; cf. footnote 25 on p. 94 above.
- 34 This sūtra is lacking in the manuscript, and there is no direct commentary on it. Hence it has been omitted, understandably enough, in Thakur's edition and the *sūtrapāṭha* attributed to Bhaṭṭa Vādindra by Jambūvijaya and by Nozawa. But I believe we are compelled to add it nonetheless, for the simple reason that elsewhere, in the long version of the VS commentary, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra quotes it (TS 14.14–15). The commentary on 6.2.18 also suggests that it belongs here, at least if my conjecture there is correct (see the following footnote).
- 35 Rather than the transmitted *rāgaviśeṣa*°, retained by Thakur, it seems to me that we must read *rāgadveṣa*°. I see no reason why only *rāga* should be mentioned, nor why *viśeṣa* should be added thereto. What has happened perhaps is that due to the loss in transmission of the previous sūtra *rāgadveṣa*° was corrupted under influence of the discussion of *rāgaviśeṣa* which now appeared to precede. One might consider a yet more radical emendation, to *icchādvēṣa*°, but that would be unnecessary, as Bhaṭṭa Vādindra may well have explained *icchā* in the preceding sūtra with *rāga*. Furthermore, the comment introducing 6.2.20 below seems to use *rāga* in the same context.
- 36 Assuming that the transmitted text is correct, *bandha* may be understood either as 'the being bound with' or as 'bond.' It cannot be merely 'connection,' for that would have been expressed with *sambandha*. This is the only occurrence I notice in Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's writings of the noun *bandha* with no verbal prefix, and this must surely be of significance; just as the following sūtras deal with liberation, and are so understood by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra, the present one explains the process of bondage. I take *bandha* with *apūrva* as well as with *śarīrādi*, as it is of course a very common idea that the enjoyment of heaven too is a bond.
- 37 It is very surprising that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra should use this Mīmāṃsā term here, but I do not see a better option than to so understand him: it does not make a convincing adjective to the following *śarīra*. On *apūrva* see most recently the highly interesting discussion in the seventh chapter of Clooney 1990, called 'Apūrva and the Development of the Mīmāṃsā after Jaimini.' Like Clooney and Halbfass I have opted not to translate the term: it seems probable to me that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra conceives of it on Kumārila's lines, as a type of potency in the soul which nonetheless 'is not merely and not even primarily a quality or subordinate ingredient of the soul: it is and remains the effect and the stored power of the sacrifice' (Halbfass 1991, 309). Halbfass has convincingly argued that Kumārila's understanding of the notion is influenced by the Vaiśeṣika's *saṃskāra* and *adr̥ṣṭa*; cf. 1991, 291 ff. and especially 307–311 (note that this chapter in Halbfass' book is a reworking of an article that appeared in 1980).

If [liberation arises from the destruction of *dharma* and *adharma* and] *dharma* and *adharma* [arise] from desire and so on, then, as they (i.e. desire and so on) never cease to arise there would never be liberation. Therefore [, since this doubt may arise,] [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

Liberation has been explained in [the section of the VS devoted to explaining] the motions of the 'soul' [i.e. the vital breath]. 6.2.20

'The soul' [here must be taken to refer to] the vital breath.³⁸ When its motions were being described [in the second *āhnika* of the fifth *adhyāya*] liberation was explained, [namely] by the *sūtra* 'When that is absent [there is] absence of conjunction and non-appearance: this is liberation' (5.2.18). And [thus] liberation is the extirpation of all specific qualities of the soul. If one objects that since pleasure³⁹ is absent [in liberation, so described] it would also not be a [proper] human goal⁴⁰ and thus it is [a state in which one's] loss is equal to [one's] gain,⁴¹ [we reply:] No, for it is [on

38 Yet another instance of the difficulty later Vaiśeṣikas had with references in the *sūtras* to motions of the soul. Candrānanda for his part writes *ātmēti manaḥ* (51.6).

39 Thakur's *tatreṣṭasyāpy abhāvād* (not marked as a conjecture) would never have fitted in the manuscript, which has only a small lacuna before *bhāvād*. It would be acceptable to read *iṣṭā-bhāvād*, but *sukhābhāvād* is I think a little more probable, and the answer to the opponent's objection is then appropriately pointed.

40 This is naturally enough a common objection raised against the Vaiśeṣika view of the state of liberation (which is also that held by most Naiyāyikas). The notion that a state in which all specific properties of the soul, including pleasure and cognition, are utterly extinguished should be one to be striven for seemed absurd to many, as is most memorably expressed in a verse which is quoted in various slightly differing versions by many authors. As given in the *Nyāya-kumudacandra* it runs *varaṃ vṛndāvane ramye śṛgālatvaṃ prapadyate | na tu vaiśeṣikīṃ muktiṃ gautamo gantum icchati ||* (828.8–9).

41 This is probably what is intended by *samavyayaphalatvam*; I take *vyayaphala* as a dvandva and *samavyayaphala* as a bahuvrīhi compound. It is perhaps best to understand *vyaya* here as referring to *duḥkha* and *phala* to *sukha* (cf. also Śaṅkara Miśra's comment on the *Nyāyalīlāvati* parallel, quoted below); both would be 'the same' in liberation, inasmuch as both disappear. The word is certainly correct as transmitted and perfectly interpretable, though Thakur emends it to a reading which I can make no sense of;* it is confirmed by its occurrence in some other passages in the same context. The earliest one I am aware of is in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, a text which Bhaṭṭa Vādindra knew and refers to, where we read *kiṃ ca yathā saṃsārāvasthāyām sukham; iṣṭam duḥkham cāniṣṭam* (I conjecture this for the printed *vāniṣṭam*), *tathā mokṣāvasthāyām duḥkha-nivṛttir iṣṭā sukhanivṛttis tv aniṣṭeti samavyayaphalatvāt tatra pravṛttir ayuktā | tad uktam— anantāni durantāni samavyayaphalāni ca | aśakyāni ca vastūni nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ |* (NBh 594.22–26). This is by the way not a *pūrvapakṣa* in the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*; Bhāsarvajña has a view of liberation which differs from that of most Naiyāyikas and is closer to an Advaitic Vedānta position. The verse Bhāsarvajña quotes is also cited, in slightly different form, by Udayana in the *Tātparyapariśuddhi*: *tad uktam— asatyāni durantāni samavyayaphalāni ca | aśakyāni ca vastūni nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ || iti* (NBh² 92.5–7), and a little later he continues *tad anena madhuv-śasamprkṛtinnabhojanadṛṣṭāntena samavyayaphalatvam apavargasya nirākṛtam* (NBh² 92.8–

the contrary perfectly] fitting that [liberation] is a human goal, because compared to pleasure suffering is absent in great[er] quantity⁴² in it.⁴³

Thus the sixth *adhyāya*.

9).

* It is possible that in this case the square brackets in Thakur's *sama[māya]vyayaphalatvam* are meant to indicate that Thakur proposes 'correcting' the transmitted *samavyayaphalatvam* to *samāvyayaphalatvam*. The latter word occurs twice, in connection with the same question of liberation and its desirability, in Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyalīlāvātī*: see especially *na cāśya* (scil. *mokṣasya*) *samāvyayaphalatvenāpuruṣārthatvam* (594.2; cf. also 595.4). The relation with our passage here is clear, but one should not be misled by the wording I quoted from the edition of the *Nyāyalīlāvātī*, as it is probably corrupt. I say this not only because I find it impossible to interpret satisfactorily and because Vallabhācārya was almost certainly aware of and influenced by the *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa* and *Tātparyapariśuddhi* passages, but also because Śaṅkara Miśra's *Nyāyalīlāvātīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* seems to support the word *samavyayaphalatva* in the *Nyāyalīlāvātī* too: see *phalasya sukhasya duḥkhasya cāviśeṣād ity arthaḥ* (595.11–12), and the subsequent quotation of yet another form of the verse we have already seen twice: *aśakyāni durantāni samavyayaphalāni* ca | *aśakyāni ca karmāṇi nārabheta vicakṣaṇaḥ* || (595.16–17).

** *samavyayaphalāni*: em., *samavāyaphalāni* ed.

- 42 I find it difficult to express Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's intentions in English here, though I think they are plain enough. It must be remembered that for him *abhāva* is a separate category, and one with infinite instances. An absence is always an absence of some particular thing (its *pratīyogin*), and the absence of *sukha* is thus something quite different from the absence of *duḥkha*. In the case of liberation, the suffering that disappears is far greater than the pleasure that is also given up, and hence it can be said that the *duḥkhābhāva* therein is far greater than the *sukhābhāva*. Though the precise form in which Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's answer is worded, with its use of this idea of difference in *abhāvas*, is not familiar to me from other texts, the general line of defence is a traditional one. In answer to the above-mentioned criticism of their concept of liberation Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas usually point out that human existence is after all for the greatest part one of suffering, and that the extinction of this suffering in liberation is more than worth the absence of such small pleasure as is possible in the bound state. The earliest, and one of the most elegant, surviving expression of this thought in the Nyāya school is to be found in the *Nyāyabhāṣya* ad *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.2, where the opponent's position is put in the words *apavarge bhīṣmaḥ khalv ayaṃ sarvoparamaḥ sarvaviprayogo 'pavargaḥ bahu bhadraḥ lupyata iti kathaṃ buddhimān sarvasukhocchedam acaitanyaṃ anum apavargaṃ rocayed iti* (NBh² 150.13–14, following the readings of the Jaisalmer manuscript as reported in the apparatus), which is answered a little later with *apavarge śāntaḥ khalv ayaṃ sarvaviprayogaḥ sarvoparamo 'pavargaḥ bahv atra kṛcchraṃ ghoram pāpakaṃ lupyata iti kathaṃ buddhimān sarvaduhkhocchedam sarvaduhkhāsamvidam apavargaṃ na rocayed iti | tadyathā madhuviṣasampṛkṭam annam anādeyam iti* (NBh² 151.16–19, again reading with the Jaisalmer manuscript).

- 43 Retaining the manuscript's *tadābhāvāt*, which one could also consider emending to *tatrābhāvāt* or *tadābhāvāt*.

Adhyāya 7, āhnika 1

[This]¹ *śāstra* has a threefold procedure:² naming by name (*uddeśa*),³ definition (*lakṣaṇa*)⁴ and investigation (*parīkṣā*). Or [in the view of some, the *śāstra* has a] fourfold [procedure]: naming by name, (sub)dividing (*vibhāga*), definition and investigation.⁵ Of these [procedures], the naming by name and (sub)division of the qualities have already been done in the first *adhyāya* with the sūtra which begins

1 The concept of the three- or four-fold *śāstrapravṛtti* seems to be peculiar to Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, so it is probably better to supply 'the' or 'this' than 'a.' Cf. *asya śāstrasya* in the Nyāyabhāṣya *locus classicus*, quoted in the following note.

2 The *locus classicus* for this threefold division of *śāstrapravṛtti* is in Pakṣilasvāmin's Nyāyabhāṣya introducing Nyāyasūtra 1.1.3, *trividhā cāsyā śāstrasya pravṛtīḥ—uddeśo lakṣaṇam parīkṣā ceti* (NBh² 181.20).

3 *uddeśa* is explained by Pakṣilasvāmin as *nāmadheyena padārthamātrābhīdhānam* (this is the reading of the Jaisalmer manuscript, see NBh² 181 n.6; *nāmadheyena padārthamātrasyābhi-dhānam* NBh² 181.21).

4 The Nyāyabhāṣya explanation of *lakṣaṇa* is *uddiṣṭasya tattvavyavasthāpakā dharmo lakṣaṇam*. This suggests 'characteristic/defining mark' or the like as a translation for *lakṣaṇa*. Later, however, *lakṣaṇa* is of course frequently used in a sense closer to 'definition,' and I translate it in this way here, partly because of its use with \sqrt{kr} .

* Thus the Jaisalmer manuscript, according to NBh² 181 n.6, supported by the Nyāyālaṅkāra, which gives *tattvavyavasthāpakā* it as a *pratīka*, and the same formulation in the Nyāyamañjarī (NM¹ vol. 1 11.17, NM² vol. 1 29.8–9); *uddiṣṭasyāttattvavyavacchedako dharmo lakṣaṇam* NBh² 181.21–22.

5 The Nyāyabhāṣya itself already refers to (*pra*)*vibhāga* as something which the *śāstra* also teaches, but does not include it among the *śāstrapravṛtis*, nor discuss the possibility that it might be reckoned among them. Cf. for instance *īatroddiṣṭasya pravibhaktasya lakṣaṇam ucya-te, yathā pramāṇānām prameyasya ca | uddiṣṭasya lakṣitasya ca vibhāgavacanam, yathā cha-lasya* (NBh² 181.23–24). The question which this naturally raises was already discussed by Uddyotakara, commenting on the Nyāyabhāṣya's introduction to 1.1.3: *uddiṣṭasya vibhāgāna-irividhāyām śāstrapravṛtāv antarbhavati | tasmād uddiṣṭavibhāgo na yuktaḥ | na, uddiṣṭavi-yena padārthābhīdhānamātram uddēśa itī* (NBh² 183.16–20). This view, that *vibhāga* falls un-der *uddeśa*, is also followed by Jayanta Bhaṭṭa, who seems to be the first to explicitly mention—and reject—a theory of a four-fold *śāstrapravṛtti*, as a *pūrvapakṣa* in his Nyāyamañjarī: *nanu ca vibhāgalakṣaṇa caturthī api pravṛtīr asty eva, bhedaḥ pramāṇasiddhāntacchalādisu tathā vyavahārāt | satyam—prathamāsūtroddiṣṭe* bhedaḥ padārthe bhavaty eva vibhāgaḥ, uddē-śārūpānapāyāt uddēśa evāsau | sāmānyasaṃjñāyā kīrtanam uddēśaḥ prakārabhedasaṃjñāyā kīrtanam vibhāga itī* (NM¹ vol. 1 11.19–22, NM² vol. 1 29.12–16). Some later authors seem however to have accepted *vibhāga* as a *pravṛtti* separate from *uddeśa*, e.g. Jinavardhana Sūri (ca. A.D. 1410) in his commentary ad *Saptapadārthī* (5.4–8). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra here does not express a preference in the matter; as may be seen by Pakṣilasvāmin's example, the fact that in the following he refers more than once to *vibhāga* does not necessarily mean that he accepts it as a distinct *śāstrapravṛtti*.

* *sūtroddiṣṭe*: NM², *sūtropadiṣṭe* NM¹

‘Colour, taste, smell [and] touch, numbers’ (1.1.5). [And] the definition has also been made in the very same place (i.e. *adhyāya*), with the sūtra which begins ‘Residing in substance, not possessing qualities’ (1.1.16). [And] the investigation, in the form of [stating that] ‘this quality [inheres] in this [substance and] this quality in this [one],’⁶ has also been carried out in the the second *adhyāya* with the sūtras⁷ ‘Earth possesses [the qualities] colour, taste, smell and touch’ (2.1.1) and so on. So⁸ what is the purpose of the seventh *adhyāya*? To remove this doubt,⁹ [the *sūtrakāra*] begins the seventh *adhyāya* [in the following manner]—

The qualities have been taught (i.e. named by name). 7.1.1

And the definition of quality has been taught. 7.1.2

And it has been taught that ‘this [substance] has such qualities, [and] this [one] has such qualities.’¹⁰ 7.1.3

[The remarks of the objector are, to a certain extent] true—the naming by name, (sub)division and definition¹¹ [of qualities] have been taught. [But] the investiga-

- 6 The conjecture *ayaṃ guṇo ’sminn ayaṃ guṇo ’sminn* seems to me a convincing one: the wording is influenced by that of 7.1.3. Thakur’s *ayaṃ guṇo ’sminn* takes no account of the lacuna, the size of which accords well with my conjecture.
- 7 There are two problems with the manuscript reading *rūparasagandhasparśavatī prthivītyādisūtreṇa* which Thakur retains. Firstly, *rūparasagandhasparśavatī prthivī* is in fact the entire text of 2.1.1 (in all sources), so that the *ādi* would be meaningless. Secondly, an ‘investigation’ of the kind meant here, the allotting of qualities to their respective substances, is of course not carried out in 2.1.1 alone: the entire *adhyāya* could be broadly described as occupying itself with the problem, with occasional digressions, and in particular the sūtras 2.1.2–5 (*rūparasasparśavaiṣya āpo dravāḥ snigdhaḥ* 2.1.2, *tejo rūpasparśavat* 2.1.3, *vāyuh sparsāvān* 2.1.4, *ta ākāśe na vidyante* 2.1.5) clearly belong together with 2.1.1 and are completely parallel in their function. Therefore the singular is also highly suspicious. Both difficulties are solved if the correction *rūparasagandhasparśavatī prthivītyādisūtraiḥ* is accepted, and a cause for the corruption is immediately evident: the influence of the *ityādisūtreṇa* which occurs twice immediately before. Of course the *ādi* now has a slightly different function from the two preceding cases: if this is felt as disturbing one could also consider a somewhat more radical emendation to *rūparasagandhasparśavatī prthivītyādi prakaraṇena* (or something similar).
- 8 With the trivial emendation of *kṛte* to *kṛterī* (the error is haplography) the construction is perfectly normal. Thakur, having been perhaps deceived by the apparent locative, emends to *kṛtāyām* to restore concord with *parīkṣā*, but this is too violent, necessitating two further alterations to the transmitted text: (*parīkṣāpy* to *parīkṣāyām api* and *evaṃrūpā* to *evaṃrūpāyām*), while the resulting absolute construction is somewhat less natural to my mind.
- 9 This is the most natural way to translate the *pariḥaran*, though it is of course a participle of the present rather than one of the future, or an infinitive.
- 10 That 7.1.2 and 7.1.3 are sūtras was first recognized by Jambūvijaya. The manuscript marks off 7.1.1–3 as a block of sūtras with a dot at the beginning and end.
- 11 It is not clear why the order of words in the compound has been changed in Thakur’s edition, especially as the manuscript reading, after the trivial emendation of *uddeśya*° to *uddeśa*°, agrees with the order in which the terms occur uncompounded above.

tion has not been carried out and therefore the seventh *adhyāya* is begun for that purpose. If [you persist in saying] that the investigation of qualities has also taken place¹² in the second [*adhyāya*], [we reply,] no, for that [*adhyāya*] is devoted to the definition and so on of substances.

In earth, colour, taste, smell and touch are solely impermanent.¹³ 7.1.4

Among these [qualities], the colour and so on of impermanent earth [substances] are destroyed by the destruction of their locus—

And by conjunction with fire.¹⁴ 7.1.5

[The colour and so on of earth are destroyed by destruction of their locus, as taught in 7.1.4] because it is observed empirically that when a pot is destroyed its colour and so on are [also] destroyed,¹⁵ and [they may also be destroyed by conjunction with fire as taught in 7.1.5] because it is observed empirically that directly after a pot

- 12 In favour of my restoration *parīkṣāpi vṛteti* above Thakur's *parīkṣokteti* are the facts that the manuscript clearly has . . . *teti*, not the admittedly palaeographically similar *kteti*, that the *akṣara* with *kṣ* did not have medial *o* (which would have been written *prṣṭhamātra* and would have been at least partly preserved), and, most importantly perhaps, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not seem elsewhere to use \sqrt{vac} and derivatives with *parīkṣā* but does write, in the *avataṛaṇa* to 5.1.1, *caturthe 'dhyāye dravyaparīkṣā vṛttā | pañcame karma-parīkṣā vartīṣyate* (Thakur's edition 59.1, correcting *vartīṣyate*—presumably a typo—to *vartīṣyate*, which is the reading of the manuscript).
- 13 Again, 7.1.4, marked by a preceding dot in the manuscript, was not recognized as a *sūtra* by Thakur. Jambūvijaya did see that it was a *sūtra*, but chose to print the text as *prthivyādīrūpa-rasagandhasparśā anityā eva*, an emendation for which I see no reason. Nozawa (1974, 472) gives the correct *sūtrapāṭha*.
- 14 Yet again, this *sūtra*—not marked in the manuscript—was taken by Thakur as part of the commentary. Jambūvijaya was the first to recognize it as a *sūtra*, followed by Nozawa. That this is correct may be seen not only from its presence in the other recensions of the VS but also from the fact that in the full version of his VS commentary Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra quotes *agnisamyogāc ca* as a *sūtra* (TS 89.26).
- 15 There is a not inconsiderable difficulty here in that the first ablative seems to give an argument for the fact that the colour and so on of a substance such as a pot are destroyed by the destruction of the pot, as taught in 7.1.4, while the second ablative, though apparently connected with the first by a *ca*, clearly gives an argument for the fact that the colour and so on of a substance such as a pot are also destroyed by conjunction with fire, as taught in 7.1.5. As the text stands, there seems to be no alternative but to take the commentary on 7.1.4, *sūtra* 7.1.5 and the commentary thereon, up to *śyāmādivināśadarśanāc ca*, as a single syntactic unit; something which is certainly unusual and which, to my mind, suggests some mishap in the course of transmission or of abbreviation. One might consider emending the text by a transposition: *ghaṭanāśe tad-rūpādīnām nāśadarśanāt* would go well as part of the commentary on 7.1.4, after *tatrānityapṛthivīrūpādīnām āśrayanāśān nāśah*. However the *ca* would remain a difficulty, even considering the possibility that it is meant to be the *ca* in the *sūtra*.

placed in the kiln has conjunction with fire its [original colour and so on,¹⁶ namely] black and so on are destroyed. If [it is objected] that there (i.e. in [the case of] a pot placed in the kiln) too [the colour and so on] are destroyed simply by the destruction of [their] locus, [we reply]: No, for there is no proof [that that is the case]. If [the objector attempts to formulate a syllogism as proof for his position, in the following way:] the colour and so on which are the object of dispute are destroyed by the destruction of the pot, because they are the colour and so on of the pot, like the colour and so on of a pot that is destroyed [e.g. by breaking],¹⁷ [we reply:] No, because this [argument]¹⁸ would also fulfill its aim by proving that [the colour and so on that are under discussion] are destroyed by the destruction of another pot,¹⁹

16 All four qualities, colour, taste, smell and touch, are (or may be) *pākaja* in earth-substances, though it is colour which is invariably treated in detail, the others being reduced to a repeated 'and so on.'

17 Compare the similar syllogism given in Vallabhācārya's *Nyāyañīlāvātī*; *rūpaṃ cāśrayanāśād eva vinaśyati, kāryarūpatvāt, naṣṭaghaṭarūpavat* (831.3–4): cf. also footnote 19 below.

18 *asya* is to be taken as referring to the syllogism or reason put forward by the opponent as a proof, as is demonstrated by some of the places where Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra uses similar expressions. Cf. e.g. *yathā hi gaganam dīrghatvātirikṭaparimāṇādhikaraṇam, dravyatvād iti gagane mahatvasiddhiḥ. evaṃ gaganam mahatvātirikṭaparimāṇādhikaraṇam dravyatvād iti dīrghatvasiddhiḥ* | ... *dīrghatvādinārthāntaratānīvyarthaṃ dīrghatvātirikṭādīpadam* | *dīrghatvādisiddhyāpi prakṛtānumānacaritārthatvasya vaktum śakyaṃ tād iti* (GKṬ 60.5–13).

19 The point Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra wishes to make becomes clear from a consideration of a related discussion in his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*. First the *Kiraṇāvalī* passage commented on: *tasmāt paramāṇuṣu pākād eva rūpādīnām vināśotpattī, avayavini ca kīraṇagunebhya evotpadaḥ. āśrayavināśād eva vināśa iti param upapadyate | tad amī prayogāḥ—pārthivāvayavi* rūpādi āśrayavināśād eva vinaśyati, avayavirūpādīvāt, dagdhapaṭarūpādīvat | tat kīraṇagunebhya evotpadyate, tata eva, tadvad eva* | (KĀ 120.8–11).

* *pārthivāvayavi*: em., *pārthivāvayava*° KĀ.

'Therefore it is most fitting that in [earth]-atoms colour and so on are destroyed and arise because of 'cooking' alone, and that in a compound [earth]substance [they] arise because of the qualities [colour and so on] of the [substance's] causes alone, [and] are destroyed because of destruction of the [substance's] locus alone. So [one can formulate] these syllogisms—the colour and so on of a compound earth substance is destroyed through destruction of [its] locus alone, because it is colour and so on of a compound substance, like the colour and so on of a cloth which has been burnt. [And] it (i.e. the colour and so on of a compound earth substance) arises from the qualities of [its] causes, because of just the same [*hetu*] (i.e. because it is colour and so on of a compound substance), and like just the same [example] (i.e. like the colour and so on of a cloth which has been burnt).'

On this passage, part of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's commentary runs as follows. '*pārthivāvayavirūpādi* iti | *pārthivāvayavirūparasagandhasparśā ity arthaḥ* | *āśrayavināśād evety evakāreṇa vahnīsaṃyogo nivartyate* | *tenāpākanikṣiptakumbharūpam āśrayavināśavināśyaṃ vahnīsaṃyogāvināśyaṃ ca, avayavirūpatvāt, pāṇītapātarūpavad iti prayogārthaḥ* | *evaṃ rasādīn api pakṣīkrīya prayogā draṣṭavyā ity grāhārthaḥ saṃmataḥ* | *kim atra yatkiṃcidāśrayavināśavināśyatvam sādhyam utāpāka-nikṣiptakumbharūpādyaśrayanāśavināśyatvam? nādyah, yatkiṃcidāśrayavināśavināśyatve āpākanikṣiptakumbhavināśāsiddher arthāntaratāvāc ca* | *nāpi dvītyah, āpākanikṣiptakumbhavināśavināśyatvasya kvacid apy aprasiddharvād drṣṭāntasya sādhyavikalavāc*

and because directly after [the pot] is drawn out of the kiln we recognize that it is the very same pot [which therefore cannot have been destroyed].²⁰

ca] (GKṬ 28.17–29.2).

[†] *utāpāka*°: em., *uta pāka*° GKṬ

“The colour and so on of a compound earth substance:” this means the colour, taste, smell and touch of a compound earth substance. “Through destruction of [its] locus alone:” the word “alone” excludes conjunction with fire [as a cause for destruction of the colour and so on of the compound earth substance]. Therefore what the syllogism means is this (*tena... iti prayogārīhaḥ*): the colour of a pot placed in the kiln is destroyed by the destruction of [its] locus and is not destroyed by conjunction with fire, because it is the colour of a compound substance, like the colour of a torn cloth. And one should regard the [other] syllogisms [which are implied by Udayana’s syllogism] similarly, making the taste and so on [respectively] into the *pakṣa* (i.e. reformulate as *āpākanikṣiptakumbharasāśrayavināśavināśyovahnīśamyogavināśyaśca, avayavirasavāt, dagdhānnarasavat* or something similar): this is the generally accepted sense of the passage. [But Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra raises an objection:] Do you here [in this syllogism] want to prove that [the colour and so on of a compound earth-substance such as a pot placed in a kiln] are destroyed by the destruction of any locus, or that they are destroyed by the destruction of the locus of the colour and so on of the pot placed in the kiln? Not the first, because if [the colour and so on of the pot placed in the kiln] is destroyed by the destruction of any locus it is not proved that the pot placed in the kiln is destroyed, and because [the being destroyed by the destruction of any locus would be] irrelevant. Nor the second, because nowhere has it been well established that [the colour and so on] are destroyed by the destruction of the pot placed in the kiln, and because the example does not possess the property to be proved.

The *ghaṭāntaranāśanāśyavasiddhi* of our passage corresponds to the first possibility in the GKṬ discussion; the syllogism put forward by the opponent is not specific enough. As we have seen, if the syllogism is formulated differently, so as to explicitly refer to the destruction of the pot placed in the kiln, it may be attacked, as in the discussion of the second possibility in the GKṬ, on the grounds that the example is not appropriate.

What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra does not however mention, in either passage, is what would most probably have been Udayana’s response: if more specificity is required, the syllogism could be reformulated with a reflexive pronoun: *pāṭhivāvayavirūpādisvāśrayavināśād eva vināśyati, avayavirūpādivāt, dagdhapaṭarūpādivāt*.

²⁰ The most striking thing here is that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra proves to be a *piṭharapākavādin*: he holds that the *pākaja* qualities are produced directly in the *avayavin*, the pot (*piṭhara*). Below he explicitly rejects the *Prāśastapādan pīlupākavāda*, according to which the pot is destroyed, broken down into its atomic parts (*pīlu*), and it is these which acquire new qualities and then once more compound to form a (different) pot. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is then the only author known to me who holds this doctrine while professing to be a Vaiśeṣika. The *piṭharapākavāda* is normally associated with the Nyāya* and the *pīlupākavāda* with Vaiśeṣika; this has even frequently been regarded as one of the chief distinctions between the two schools. Thus after briefly explaining the Vaiśeṣika theory in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, Mādhava remarks *līṭham: pīlupākaprakriyā, piṭharapākaprakriyā tu naiyāyikadhīśammatā* (89.16; among modern authors cf. Shastri 1976, 247 n.19, Tüstig 1982, 36–37). This may be taken as another example of the quite surprising diversity which can be found in the Vaiśeṣika, and which might prove far greater yet if more literature of the school were available to us. It is to be noted that the sūtras themselves are not sufficiently explicit on the point.

In his commentary on the *Kiraṇāvalī*, be it noted, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra comments on the whole

Because other qualities appear.²¹ 7.1.6

If the old [colour and so on,] black and so on do not disappear through conjunction with fire, then the arising of [new colour and so on,] red and so on is not possible.

By this [same principle] it is taught that [colour and so on] are impermanent even in eternal [substances]. 7.1.7

'By this' [that is to say] by the appearance of other colours and so on through conjunction with fire²² the impermanence of the colour and so on of earth atoms too is to be established.

[Colour and so on] are permanent in water, fire and wind, because the substances [they inhere in] are eternal. 7.1.8

The colour, taste and touch of water atoms, the colour and touch of fire atoms and the touch of wind atoms—these are not destroyed, because, in as much as the atoms [that they inhere in] are permanent, there is no destruction of [their] loci [to serve

faithfully on Udayana's exposition of the classical Vaiśeṣika theory, though as we saw in the previous note, he does at one place raise an objection. At the end, too, he makes a remark from which it may be gathered that he does not subscribe wholeheartedly to the theory he has been commenting on: *seyam pākajotpattau tjunārgēṇa granthavyākhyā, tarkapramānacintā tu pratyekagranthagocarā paurvāparyānusandhātmanuṣyānām na durlabhā* (GK 40.15–17).

* The *piṭharapākavāda* was also held by at least some Mīmāṃsakas; cf. e.g. Udayana's remark (after refuting arguments against the *pīlupākavāda*) *tathāpi na naśyanty eva ghaṭādāya iti mīmāṃsakadurdurūdhāḥ, te 'nukampantiyāḥ* (KĀ 122.3–4). Kumārila's position, however, is not (to me at least) unambiguously clear: the passage in the *Tantravārtika* ad *Mīmāṃsāsūtra* 3.1.12 (see especially *nanu guṇāntarotpattikāle 'nyad eva dravyam iti na vyabhicarati na tāvad ayam ekāntaḥ kāryadravyāntarodbhavaḥ* | *sthithe 'pi hi bhavaty eva dravye kiṃcid guṇāntaram* || *yeṣāṃ tāvāt kāryadravyāny eva ghaṭādīni pacyante piṭharāṇāṃ tanmatenābheda eva* | *pailūkānām api tu paramāṇuṣu vyabhicārah* | *yādṛṣaṃ tv asmābhir dravyam abhihitam tādṛśasya sarvatra guṇamātram eva bhidyate na svarūpam* | 45.13–18) seems to me, *pace* Jhā's translation (1983, 975–976), not to allow the matter to be settled. I do not know on what basis Miśra states that the Mīmāṃsakas 'appear to be perhaps the oldest propounders of the *Piṭharapākavāda*' (1987, 82 n. 65: no reference given).

21 With Jambūvijaya, I find it necessary to add this sūtra, 7.1.6 in Candrānanda's text, and found also in the Ahmedabad and Trivandrum manuscripts, though not in Śaṅkara Miśra's version of the sūtras. The following sentence allows itself most readily to be understood as a comment on this sūtra: note that there is no logical connection with the preceding sentences in the commentary on 7.1.5. Perhaps even more tellingly, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra takes *etena* in the following sūtra as meaning *agnisaṃyogād rūpāntarādiprādurbhāvena*, an interpretation which is quite natural if we assume he knew this sūtra but otherwise difficult to justify.

22 Like Thakur I find the compound *agnisaṃyogarūpāntarādiprādurbhāvena*, as in the MS, difficult to accept; however *agnisaṃyogād* for *agnisaṃyoga*^o seems somewhat more natural than Thakur's *agnisaṃyogatas*.

as a] cause for the destruction of the colour and so on. If [it is objected] that conjunction [of the atoms of water, fire and wind] with fire is [a possible] cause of their destruction [just as in the case of earth atoms, we reply:] No, for even if [the atoms of water, fire and wind] have a thousand conjunctions with fire their former colour and so on do not change.

In impermanent [water, fire and wind substances, colour and so on are] impermanent because of the impermanence of the substance [they inhere in]. 7.1.9

The colour and so on which exist²³ in impermanent water, fire and air [substances] are impermanent too, because of the existence of destruction of their locus [as a possible] cause of their [own] destruction.

In earth [substances formed from parts], [colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities [colour and so on] of the cause(s). 7.1.10

And produced by 'cooking' (i.e. conjunction with fire). 7.1.11

Earth is of two kinds: effect (i.e. substances formed from parts) and eternal (i.e. atoms). Of these, in earth which is an effect colour and so on are [also] effects, and they are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes [of the earth substance which is an effect]. For the colour, taste, smell and touch in an earth-dyad [are produced] from the colour, taste, smell and touch of the [two] earth atoms [which form the dyad], [the colour, taste, smell and touch] in an [earth-]triad [are produced] from those (i.e. the colour, taste, smell and touch of the three earth-dyads which form the triad), and [the colour, taste, smell and touch] in an aggregate of four [earth-triads] (*caturāṇuka*) [are produced] from those (i.e. the colour, taste, smell and touch of the four earth-triads), and so on, down to final substances. 'And produced by cooking,' because the colour and so on of a pot placed in the kiln and so on are determined by [empirical observation of] positive and negative concomitance to be produced by conjunction with fire, [and]²⁴ since [one can make an] inference

23 The *varāmānarūpādayaḥ* of the MS. accepted by Thakur, must be wrong, for in Sanskrit of the kind we are dealing with this would be taken to mean 'the colour and so on which exist at present.' This cannot be intended here, and it is most unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra would express himself in this way if he did not mean this, so I assume a minor corruption, and read *varāmānā rūpādayaḥ* which is correct idiom: the *varāmāna* being used in the weak sense of 'to exist, to be.'

24 I take the two ablatives, *agnisaṃyogajātāvadhāraṇāt* and *saṃyogajātānumānāt*, as parallel, rather than subordinating one to the other. The first must refer to a conclusion drawn on the basis of empirical observation (note *avadhāraṇa* rather than *anumāna*); one notes that a new colour arises in pots placed in the kiln after they come into conjunction with fire, and that pots

of the fact that the colour and so on of earth atoms is produced by conjunction on grounds of [the fact that] while [these colours and so on are] impermanent²⁵ [and] not audible (i.e. not sound)²⁶ they are specific qualities (*viśeṣaḥ*) of permanent [substances], like cognition and so on.²⁷ Therefore in some earth substances which are effects colour and so on are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes, and in some they are produced by 'cooking.' [But] in earth atoms [colour and so on] are only produced by 'cooking.'

However [in contrast with our explanation] Ātreya, Praśastapāda²⁸ and others

which are not placed in the kiln and do not have conjunction with fire do not change colour in this way (*anvaya* and *vyatireka*). The second ablative refers to an inference with little connection to empirical observation, based on certain other assumptions of the Vaiśeṣika. Though this inference might well be thought sophistical enough for a *navya*, it is in fact of some antiquity; cf. footnote 27 below.

- 25 This qualification is necessary to exclude permanent, unchanging qualities of permanent substances, such as the size of atoms.
- 26 Not being sound is explicitly stated as a *viśeṣaḥ* of the *hetu* because otherwise two of the three types of sound, viz. sound which arises from disjunction and sound which arises from sound, would be counter-examples. Compare the formulation of Vyomaśiva's very similar syllogism in footnote 27 below.

- 27 A close parallel to this syllogism is found already in Vyomaśiva's *Vyomavātū*. Neither edition has the text quite right, so I take the opportunity to present the correct form, which must be as follows: *pārthivaparamānūrūpādayaḥ saṃyogajāḥ, vibhāgajaśabdajaśabdānyavānityatve sati nityaviśeṣaḥ* (Vyo¹ 450.6–9, Vyo² vol. 2 25.19–21, MS f. 114r19–21).

**vibhāgaja*°: Vyo¹, *vibhāgajaga*°MS, *vibhāgajavibhāga*°Vyo².

¹*nityaviśeṣaḥ*atvāt: MS Vyo¹, *nityasya viśeṣaḥ*atvāt Vyo².

²*vibhāgajaśabdajaśabdānyavānityatve*atvāt: MS, *vibhāgajaśabdajaśabdānyavānityatve*atvāt Vyo¹, *vibhāgajavibhāgaśabdajaśabdānyavānityatve*atvāt Vyo².

The emendations of Shastri, the editor of Vyo², are certainly incorrect, because disjunction is not a *viśeṣaḥ* of any substance and therefore does not need to be mentioned here, whereas sound which arises from disjunction does (cf. footnote 26 above). Note that Vyomaśiva's formulation of the inference is actually somewhat more precise than that of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra, as the latter's *asrāvaṇatve sati* unnecessarily excludes *saṃyogajaśabda*, which does have both *hetu* and *sādhya*dharma.

- 28 This could be seen as implying that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra had access to a lost work of Praśastapāda, perhaps the *Ṭīkā* of which we hear in other sources (cf. Chemparathy 1968, 66–67; Bronkhorst 1993a, 148ff.), for in the PDhS we do not actually find a remark on how the sūtras 7.1.10 and 7.1.11 are precisely to be taken, nor is an explicit *prakriyā* of nine moments given—in fact, there is considerable discussion among the commentators as to how many distinct instants are required for the process as described by Praśastapāda. So if Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's remark is to be taken completely literally, this information is of no little interest for the history of the Vaiśeṣika.* On the other hand, if Bhaṭṭa Vādindra knew the *Ṭīkā* he seems to have been the latest author, by some centuries, who did so, and I find it also conceivable that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra may here mean by 'Praśastapāda', the PDhS as interpreted by its commentators. Still another possibility is that Ātreya, whose commentary on the VS Bhaṭṭa Vādindra certainly must have used, attributed the following *prakriyā* rightly or wrongly to Praśastapāda.

explain the sūtra 'In earth [substances, colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities [colour and so on] of the cause(s)' (7.1.10) as expounding the fact that the colour and so on of earth substances which are effects are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of their causes, and [explain] the sūtra 'And produced by conjunction with fire'²⁹ (~7.1.11) as expounding the fact that the colour and so on of earth atoms are produced by 'cooking' (i.e. Ātreya, Praśastapāda and others apply 7.1.10 to compound earth substances alone and 7.1.11 to earth atoms alone). The process of formation (*prakriyā*) [of the new colour and so on as described by Ātreya etc. is as follows]:³⁰ in the first instant a movement [arises] in the atoms of

* Jambūvijaya, after quoting part of the passage we are dealing with, including the reference to Praśastapāda, continues *iti mī. vṛttau* [pr. 65] *praśastapādena ekaṃ sūtram* [7] 1' 10' *dvidhā vibhajya vyākhyātām iti nirdeśo dṛśyate* | *praśastapādabhāṣe tu pākajoiḥpativivāre...* *āyam abhiprāyo yadyapi lakṣyate tathāpi tatrasya sūtrasyānirdeśāt praśastapādena sūtrāṇām itkāpi vyarctiḥ gamyate* (from the *prastāvanā* of his edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, p. 8 n. 5).

29 It is a little surprising that 7.1.11 here is quoted with a slight variation in reading. As far as sense is concerned, however, the variant makes no difference: we frequently find *pāka* explained as *agnisaṃyoga* or *vahnisaṃyoga*; cf. for instance, from the *Vyomavāṭī*, *pāko* 'gnisaṃyogaḥ, tasmā jātāḥ pākajāḥ' (Vyo² vol. 2 20.11). I see no necessity to emend the text, and Thakur's *vahnisaṃyogāt pākajāś ceti* does not convince me.

30 The *prakriyā* given here, with relatively few details, is different from all others that I have seen, although the most commonly accepted ones are also of nine instants. These *prakriyās* and the subtle differences between them, are urgently in need of a critical study, which I cannot offer here. The absence, till now, of such a study may be due to the fact that many scholars subscribe to the view of Faddegon, who called the passage discussing this topic in the *Nyāyakandālī* one 'which for its absurdity is not worth translating' (1918, 412). For a descriptive survey of some different *prakriyās* found in various Nyāya ad Vaiśeṣika texts see Tüsting 1982, 37–44. As comparative material, I shall quote here a similarly brief nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana, the text of which I give as edited by Jetly (the numbers also being his): *nodanādikrameṇa dvyaṇukanāśaḥ* (1), *naṣṭe dvyaṇuke paramāṇv agnisaṃyogāt śyāmādinām nivṛttiḥ* (2), *nivṛtteṣu śyāmādiṣu punar anyasmād agnisaṃyogād rakṣādīnām utpattiḥ* (3), *utpanneṣu rakṣādīṣu — uttarasaṃyogāt pūrvakriyānivṛttiḥ* (4), *īto — 'dṛṣṭavadāimānusamāyogāt paramāṇvau dvyaṇukārambhanāya kriyā kriyayā pūrvadeśād vibhāgaḥ* (5), *vibhāgena ca pūrvadeśasaṃyoganāśaḥ* (6), *tannāṣe paramāṇvantareṇa saṃyogotpattiḥ* (7), *saṃyuktābhyām paramāṇubhyām dvyaṇukārambhaḥ* (8), *ārabdhe dvyaṇuke kāraṇaguṇebhyaḥ kāryagurūnām rūpādīnām utpattiḥ* (9) *iti yathākramam nava kṣaṇāḥ* (KĀ 122.15–22). The text between arrows is missing in Jetly's best manuscript, from Jaisalmer, and must be deleted, for if it is not, what is labeled by Jetly as the fifth instant would in fact require two instants: the *kriyā* and the *vibhāga* caused by it cannot of course occur in the same moment. In two other places I would propose adopting readings quoted from the same manuscript in Jetly's notes: *dravyārambhanāya* instead of *dvyaṇukārambhanāya* and *°saṃyoganivṛtis tasmā nivṛtte* for *°saṃyoganāśaḥ tannāṣe*, though these changes do not significantly affect the sense. One more feature of the text is a little doubtful, the *ca* after *vibhāgena* in the instant marked 6, but here no variants are reported. The *prakriyā* then agrees in substance and almost exactly in wording with that given in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, which may well have been borrowed directly from the *Kiraṇāvalī*. I quote the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, adding my own numbering (that given in the *Kiraṇāvalī* quote above must be adjusted

the pot and so on which has been placed in the kiln, due to [their] being struck by fire [atoms] or due to being impelled [by the fire atoms], [and this motion is one] which produces a disjunction which is in opposition to the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad; in the second instant³¹ the disjunction which is in opposition to the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad [is produced]; in the third instant the conjunction [of two earth atoms] which produces the dyad is destroyed; in the fourth instant the dyad is destroyed; in the fifth instant the [colour and so on] black and so on of the atoms is destroyed by conjunction with fire and a disjunction with ether and so on [arises], [which is] produced by disjunction [namely of the two atoms which formed the dyad] for the atom which has motion; in the sixth instant [the colour and so on] red and so on arise [in the atoms] through another conjunction with fire³² and [simultaneously] the former conjunction of [each

to agree with it). *nodanādikrameṇa dvyaṇukanāśaḥ* (1), *naṣṭe dvyaṇuke paramāṇāv agniśaṃyogāc chyāmādīnām nivṛttiḥ* (2), *nivṛtteṣu śyāmādiṣu punar anyasmād agniśaṃyogād raktā-dīnām utpattiḥ* (3), *utpanneṣu raktādiṣu adṛṣṭavadātmasaṃyogāt paramāṇau dravyārambha-nāya kriyā* (4), *tayā pūrvadeśād vibhāgaḥ* (5), *vibhāgena pūrvadeśasaṃyoganivṛttiḥ* (6), *tas-min nivṛtte paramāṇvantareṇa saṃyogotpattiḥ* (7), *saṃyuktābhyām paramāṇubhyām dvyaṇu-kārambhah* (8), *ārabdhe dvyaṇuke kāraṇaguṇādibhyaḥ kāryaguṇādīnām rūpādīnām utpattiḥ* (9) *iti yathākramaṃ nava kṣaṇāḥ* (89.8–15); here the only suspicious feature in the text seems to be the *ādi* after *kāraṇaguṇa* and *kāryaguṇa* in the ninth instant.

- 31 The manuscript varies between compounds such as *prathamakṣaṇe* and uncompounded forms such as *dvitīye kṣaṇe*. Thakur has chosen to print only compounds, and it is certainly possible that he is right and that the variation was introduced during transmission. But it is equally possible that Bhaṭṭa Vādyāra himself varied his wording, whether unconsciously or for reasons of style, and the same inconsistency is found in the *pākajotipatti* section of his GKṬ (as printed), though admittedly not quite as flagrantly; we have e.g. *caturthe kṣaṇe* at 39.13 and *trītiyakṣaṇe* at 39.22. My policy has therefore been to follow the manuscript as far as possible; in cases where the precise form could not be established due to loss of the crucial letters (thus at instants four and six) I have been guided by the amount of space that would have been available—an *akṣara* with medial *e* (*prṣṭhamātra*) would take up markedly more space. In the case of the third instant, where the scribe has written *trītikṣaṇe*, the choice seems even more of a toss-up, but it might be marginally more easy to skip over a *ya* than a *ye* with *prṣṭhamātra e* so I have followed the path of least resistance and read *trītiyakṣaṇe* with Thakur.
- 32 There is a small lacuna here, and I differ from Thakur as to how to restore it. His *ṣaṣṭha[kṣaṇe bhogyadrṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇu]saṃyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ* must be wrong: although a conjunction between souls and the atoms which is dependant on the *adrṣṭa* (i.e. *dharma* and *adharma*) of (future) 'users' (of the pot; cf. e.g. *bhaginām udakādyāharaṇadvāreṇa tatsādhyasukhaduḥkhādyanubhavabhāginām* KĀ 120.19–20) plays a role in Prāśastapāda's account of the process, it is as a cause of the arising of motion in the atoms after the new colour and so on have arisen, not as a cause for the arising of the new colours themselves; cf. *īdanantaram bhoginām adrṣṭāpekṣād ātmāṇusaṃyogād utpannapākajeṣv aṇuṣu karmotpattau teṣāṃ paraspara-saṃyogād dvyaṇukādikrameṇa kāryadravyam utpadyate* (107.2–4). Perhaps Thakur misunderstood this passage, and took the ablative *ātmāṇusaṃyogād* with the immediately following absolute locative. That this is not possible is clear from the sentence which precedes the one just quoted in the PDhS, *tasmin vinaṣṭe svatantreṣu paramāṇuṣv agniśaṃyogād auṣṇyāpekṣāc*

individual] atom with *ākāśa* and so on ceases; in the seventh instant a conjunction [of the individual atoms] with another atom [arises], in the eighth instant a [new earth-]dyad arises; [and, finally,] in the ninth instant colour and so on³³ arises in the dyad in order preceded by the qualities of the causes (i.e. the atoms).³⁴ [All] this [, however,] is not correct, because there is no proof [that this entire process takes place as described] and because it has [already] been taught [ad 7.1.5; see p. 104] that [it] is contradicted by [our] recognition [of the fired pot as identical with the pot placed in the kiln].

In water, fire and wind [colour and so on are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of their causes. 7.1.12

In water and so on which are an effect, colour and so on are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes, for it is established by direct perception that the colour and so on of whole compound substances (*avayavins*) of water and so on are produced by the colour and so on of part substances of water and so on.

[Colour and so on which are] produced by 'cooking' do not occur [in water, fire and wind].³⁵ 7.1.13

[In the form of a syllogism:] The colour and so on of effect-substances of water and so on are not produced by conjunction with fire, because they are colour and so on of water and so on, like the colour and so on of atoms of water and so on. [And] the colour and so on of atoms of water and so on are not produced by 'cooking,' because they are eternal. like ether.

chyāmādīnām vināśaḥ punar anyasmād agnisamyogād auṣṇyāpekṣāt pākajā jāyante (106.23–107.2): cf. also e.g. the fourth instant in the nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana and in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, quoted in footnote 30 above. This immediately suggests a more plausible restoration for our text-passages. I read *ṣaṣṭhaksāṇe 'nyasmād agnisamyogād raktādīnām utpattiḥ*; the lost portion is not large enough for the scribe to have written *punar anyasmād*. That this is correct, and that *punar* may be safely omitted, is shown by parallels such as *tato 'nyasmād vahnisamyogāt paramāṇumātre raktādyutpattiḥ* (GKṬ 27.8–9).

33 One might well expect *raktādīnām* here instead of *rūpādīnām*, but the latter is customary in this context; cf. e.g. the ninth instant in the nine-instant *prakriyā* given by Udayana and in the *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*, quoted in footnote 30 above. The reason for this is perhaps that at this stage of the procedure the exact colour is of little importance; the pot is built up in the way that compound substances always are, with the effect taking on the colour of its causes.

34 The compound *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakakrameṇa* is difficult to translate literally. What is meant is 'in / with the usual order of formation of compound substances, whereby the qualities of the effect are caused by the qualities of the cause.' The word appears also to be used by Praśasta- as *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakakrameṇa*, *kāraṇapūrvakakrameṇa* and *kāraṇaguṇaprakrameṇa*; the word-index of the PDhS prepared by Bronkhorst and Ramseier (1994) may be used to find the relevant passages.

35 7.1.13 was first recognized as a sūtra by Jambūvijaya, followed in this by Nozawa.

Because [only] a substance without qualities [of a particular type can] produce³⁶ a qualities [of that type in its self],³⁷ motions and qualities do not have qualities. 7.1.14

For [only] a substance [can be] a *samavāyikāraṇam* of qualities. And quality and motion are not substance; hence qualities are not produced in them. Quality and motion do not possess qualities, because they are not substance. What[ever] possesses quality is a substance, for example a pot. In the case of [a cognition in the form] '[this] cloth is white,' however, the notion 'white' with regard to a substance is due to connection [of the substance, i.e. the cloth] with the quality 'white,'³⁸ [and the notion of 'white'] with regard to a colour is due to connection [of the colour] with the universal 'whiteness', not because the colour possesses the quality 'white.' As for (tu) the notion 'a white [cow] goes'³⁹ in regard to a substance, it [arises] through connection [of the substance, i.e. the cow] with the quality 'white' and a motion, not because the motion possesses the quality white.

By this [the qualities which are] produced by 'cooking' are explained.
7.1.15

'By this' [means] by the expounding of the fact that [only] a substance can produce a quality [in its self].

And because [colour and so on] reside in one [single] substance. 7.1.16

36 In the sense of being its material cause. *ā-√rambh* is most frequently used with regard to the producing of new compound substances by part-substances, but already *Prāśastapāda* also sometimes uses it in contexts of the arising of qualities or motions (cf. e.g. *guṇakarmāmbhe* PDhS 139.15).

37 With Jambūvijaya. I supply *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt* to the *karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ* which is all that the manuscript has here. The sūtra then agrees with Candrānanda's version (7.1.12). Thakur and Nozawa follow the manuscript. But the commentary on this sūtra already seems to presuppose the supplied words or something very similar: the use of the term *guṇārambha* is suggestive, and the commentary unusually prolix if Bhaṭṭa Vādindra did not read the text in this form. Furthermore, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra glosses the *etena* of the following sūtra with *dravyasya guṇārambhapratipādanena*, with no further comment, which I find incredible if he did not have these words or a near equivalent in his *sūtrapāṭha*. Their presence is also attested by the Ahmedabad manuscript and the Trivandrum manuscript, though the latter has *guṇāntarārambhāt* in place of *guṇārambhāt*, and by a citation in the *Yuktidīpikā*, where, with a slight difference, we read *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇārambhaḥ | karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ* (51.23); or should this be emended to agree with Candrānanda's reading? The entire sūtra is missing in Śaṅkara Miśra's version, as is also 7.1.15.

38 Here *guṇayoga* is to be taken in an ontological sense, as is shown by the following *śūklatvajātiyoga* and *śūklaguṇakarmayoga*. Differently in the commentary on 7.1.20; cf. footnote 49 on p. 114 below.

39 Cf. the progressive series (each successive term adding new information) *sad dravyam pṛthivī viśāṇī śuklo gaur gacchati* (PDhS 186.18–19).

The contradiction between black and red and so on must be removed either by a difference of place or a difference of time. And they have no difference of place, because they reside in one [single] substance. Therefore the contradiction is [to be] removed by a difference in time. [And] therefore the [colours] red and so on arise directly after the disappearance of black and so on or at [exactly] the [same] time as the disappearance of black and so on.⁴⁰

The perception and non-perception of an atom⁴¹ and a large [substance] have been explained [in the fourth *adhyāya* and are] permanent.⁴² 7.1.17

One must supply 'in the fourth *adhyāya*.' The non-perception of an atom and the

- 40 The *śyāmādivṛttisamavāye* of the manuscript can hardly be correct: *samavāya* is itself a *vṛtti*, a being-in-something, and is furthermore one, not many, (cf. so that it is odd, to say the least, to speak of 'the *samavāya* existing in black and so on.' Thakur's emendation *śyāmādivṛtti samavāyena*, however, also seems incoherent, especially in view of the following *vā*. If we assume that the correct text is *śyāmādivṛttisamaye*, on the other hand, the corruption can be easily explained as caused by haplography (two successive syllables with medial *i*) combined with the wrong expectation of *samavāya*—after all a word which occurs very frequently in a Vaiśeṣika text—in place of *samaya*. The *vā* now makes good sense. Another emendation which yields nearly the same sense would be *śyāmādivṛttisamakālam* (eva), but the error is then a little harder to explain. Parallels for both idioms can be found in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary, e.g. *nanu dvyarṇukādivināśādibhyaḥ śyāmādivṛttisamaya eva paramāṇor ākāśādina vibhāgaḥ* (GKṬ 38.4–5), *yadā dvyarṇukavināśottarakṣaṇe paramāṇudvayavibhāgena śyāmādivināśasamakālam paramāṇoḥ pūrṇākāśadeśavibhāgo janyate* (GKṬ 38.19–21). Unfortunately, our abridged text gives no further details on exactly how the change takes place according to Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra, but it is at least conceivable that he should say that the new qualities arise either in the moment after the destruction of the old ones or in exactly the same moment. The two possibilities reflect the problem of whether or not there is a brief moment during which the substance has no colour.
- 41 It seems better to translate *aṇu* as 'atom' here, rather than as 'an atomic substance,' for in the fourth *adhyāya* (cf. the following note) only atoms are referred to and not other substances of atomic size, and 4.1.6, quoted in the commentary below, would not apply to dyads.
- 42 While both Candrānanda (*nitya iti adhyāyanāma*, 53.22) and Śaṅkara Miśra (*nitya iti viṣayinaṃ nityatvapratipādakaṃ caturthādhyāyam upalakṣayati* 294.5–6) take *nitye* as a locative actually meaning 'in the fourth *adhyāya*,' Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's *caturthādhyāya iti śeṣaḥ*, if the text is correct, seems to rule out that he so interpreted the word. Unfortunately there is no explicit commentary preserved, but I presume that he must have taken *nitye* as a predicate agreeing with the dual *upalabdhyanupalabdhī*. The intended sense might then be that the perception / nonperception of large substances / atoms has been taught (in the fourth *adhyāya*), and these are permanent, i.e. atoms are always imperceptible and large substances always (i.e. as long as they last, which is indeed forever in the case of the all-pervading substances, but not in the case of compound large substances) are perceptible (to those who are capable of perceiving them). The more natural interpretation, that they are taught as being permanent, is problematic for the sūtras of the fourth *adhyāya* say nothing to that effect. Cf. also 7.1.25 and footnote 58 below.

perception of a large [substance have been explained].⁴³ For in the fourth [*adhyāya* we find] the two sūtras 'Perception with regard to a large [substance arises] because of [its] possessing many substances'⁴⁴ [as *samavāyikāraṇas*] and because of [its] colour' (4.1.5) and 'Because it does not possess a substance [as *samavāyikāraṇa*] there is no perception with regard to an atom' (4.1.6).⁴⁵

[A substance is] large because of having many causes, because of the largeness of [its] causes and[or] because of a particular kind of loose connection. 7.1.18

'Because of having many causes,' as in [the case of] a triad which is produced from three dyads which are not loosely connected; for this cause (i.e. the three dyads) is not large and there is no loose connection. 'Because the largeness of [its] causes,' as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of a pair of threads produced from two threads which are not loosely connected; for there the causes are not many and there is no loose connection. 'A particular kind of loose connection' [i.e.] a loose connection of the causes; [a substance may be large] because of this, as in [the case of] a substance which is an effect which is produced from two loosely connected triads; for there the causes are not many and largeness of the causes, though existent, is not a cause [of the largeness of the effect].⁴⁶ [Sometimes these various possible causes are combined; thus] largeness [arises] because of having many causes

⁴³ The manuscript reading, *aṇor upalabdhiḥ mahato nupalabdhiḥ*, must clearly be wrong: perhaps it arose due to a scribe (unconsciously?) assuming that the two pairs of the sūtra must be taken *yathāsaṃkhyā*.

⁴⁴ The *anekadravyavāḍ* of the manuscript, followed by Thakur, has been emended to *anekadravyavāḍ* because the latter reading is clearly presupposed by the commentary on 4.1.5. In the text of this sūtra as it occurs in the fourth *adhyāya* the manuscript reading is even more seriously corrupt than here: the sūtra appears as *mahaty anekadravyārūpāpaccopalabdhiḥ*, but Thakur's correction to *mahaty anekadravyavāḍ rūpāc copalabdhiḥ* is doubtless sound: the commentary contains the words *anekadravyam āśrayo yasya tad anekadravyam* | *tadvatvāt* | *tadārabdhavāt* | (44.9–10).

**anekadravyam*: em. with Thakur (silently), *enekadravyam* MS.

**tadvatvāt*: em. with Thakur (silently), *tadvatvāt* MS.

⁴⁵ 4.1.6 is omitted in the manuscript at the relevant place in the fourth *adhyāya* but was rightly supplied by Thakur, chiefly on the strength of our passage here, as may be supposed. I differ from Thakur only in emending the *adravyavāḍ* of the manuscript to *adravyavāḍ*, which makes the sūtra more closely parallel to 4.1.5, and seems to me to be at least somewhat supported by the first sentence of what is to be taken as its commentary, *tatra paramāṇau dravyārabdhanābhāvāc cākṣurādīnā nupalabdhiḥ* (44.15): cf. the commentary on 4.1.5 quoted in footnote 44 above.

**cākṣurādīnā*: em. with Thakur (silently), *ca-cākṣurādīnā* MS.

⁴⁶ This curious idea is already present, in essence, in *Prāśastapāda*'s PDhS; *pracayaś ca tūla-piṇḍayor vartamānaḥ piṇḍārambhakāyavaprasūtilasaṃyogān apēksamāṇa itaretarapiṇḍavayavasāṃyogāpekṣo vā dvitūlake mahatvām ārabhate, na bahuvamahatvāni, samānasaṃkhyāpalaparimāṇair ārabdhe tūlayadarśanāt* (131.10–15). In other words, the reason why in

and because of largeness [of the causes], as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of three threads which is produced from three threads which are of equal largeness and are not loosely connected. [And] largeness [may arise] because of having many causes and because of a loose connection, as for instance in [the case of] an effect-substance which is produced from three loosely connected triads. [And finally] largeness [may arise] because of having many causes, largeness of the causes and loose connection, as for instance in [the case of] a substance consisting of three threads which is produced from three loosely connected threads.⁴⁷

Atomic size is the opposite of that.⁴⁸ 7.1.19

[Atomic size is] 'the opposite' of 'that,' [i.e.] of largeness which is produced from having many causes, largeness of the causes [and/or] loose connection.

[The designations] 'atomic' [and] 'large' [are applied to] that [substance] because of the existence of a special [, pronounced large size] and because of the absence of a special [, pronounced large size].
7.1.20

With regard to 'that' [i.e., in the first case,] the well-known [example of an] *āmalaka* [fruit] and so on, one speaks of [it being] atomic through secondary usage⁴⁹ [of the term 'atomic' based on] the absence of a particularly pronounced largeness, with reference to the size of a *bilva* [fruit],⁵⁰ [and, in the second case, with regard to]

the case of two balls of cotton which are combined to form a single one, largeness and number of the causes is thought not to cause the size of the product, is that the latter is larger than in the case of the size of a product formed from causes which are otherwise similar but lack *praca*ya, i.e. are more compact.

47 Due to an unfortunate eyeskip the last sentence of the commentary on this sūtra has been lost in Thakur's text, together with the following sūtra, 7.1.19, and the first two words of its commentary.

48 Despite the omission of this sūtra in Thakur's edition (cf. the previous note), Jambūvijaya rightly supplied it on the basis of the commentary (though this too was garbled in the edition) and Candrānanda's 7.1.17.

49 Here I take *guṇayoga* as 'secondary / metaphorical usage,' for, first of all, *mahatvaparakṣā-bhāva* is not ontologically a quality, and secondly this agrees well with the usual Vaiśeṣika explanations; cf. e.g. *kuvalāmalakabīlvādiṣu mahatsv api tatprakarsabhāvābhāvam apekṣya bhāktō 'nyuvavahārah* (PDhS 130.25–131.1). Differently in the commentary on 7.1.14; cf. footnote 38 on p. 111 above.

50 It seems at least probable that a word has dropped out in the text, and that the construction should be parallel with the following one; in other words, since we are now dealing with *relative* largeness and smallness, it should be stated relative to what the *āmalaka* is small. And that the point of comparison is a *bilva* fruit may be assumed on the basis of the commentary to 7.1.21 (cf. page 115 below) and the existence of numerous parallels (e.g. that quoted from the PDhS in footnote 49 above).

the dyad, which is established by the *śāstra*,⁵¹ one speaks of [it as] 'large' through secondary usage [of the word 'large' based on] a kind of 'excess'⁵² with reference to the size of an atom.

[Next the *sūtrakāra*] teaches a [reason] refuting [the possibility that the designations 'atomic' and 'large' in cases such as referred to in 7.1.20 are used in] the primary sense—

Because [they occur at] the same time. 7.1.21

The removal of the contradiction between atomic and large [sizes must take place] through a difference of property-possessor or through a difference of time. In this case there is no difference of property-possessor, because the *bilva*, *āmalaka*, dyad and so on are one.⁵³ And there is no difference of time, 'because' the usages of [the designations] 'atomic' [and] 'large' [occur at] one time.

51 The conjecture *śāstrasiddhadvyaṇuke* is a hesitant proposal to solve one of the most difficult crux passages of this *adhyāya*. Let me first put the case for the conjecture. The following *paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaḥ* *vyākhyāyogāt*, which there seems to be no reason to suspect, implies that the object, in the locative, must be one which is referred to as large only metaphorically speaking, compared to an atom; in other words it must not be large in the literal sense. A dyad is then the only object which seems to plausibly fit this description: it possesses the sizes 'atomic' and 'short' as an atom does, and though it does not possess the peculiar (spherical) size of an atom, this does not mean that it is larger than one. Further, the mention of a *dvyaṇuka* in *bilvāmalakadvyaṇukāder ekavāt* in the commentary to 7.1.22 only makes sense if *dvyaṇukas* had been mentioned before as an object to which a size is sometimes attributed which it has only metaphorically speaking. For the intended meaning cannot be that the dyads of a *bilva* and *āmalaka* are one, since that is not literally true, and if not meant literally is irrelevant to the problem under discussion there. If then a *dvyaṇuka* is the object we want, I conjecture that it may have been compounded with a qualification corresponding to *prasiddha* in the other example; while it obviously often happens in ordinary *vyavahāra* that one refers to something as small which is only relatively so, it can only be in rare cases, and probably among *śāstrins*, that dyads and atoms are spoken of, and their sizes compared. The *akṣaras ga* and *śa* are very similar in Malayalam script, so that it is not too far fetched to suppose the surviving *ga* to be a scribal error. Against this, it must in fairness be said that such an example as this then would be is not known to me from any other text, nor can I find a parallel, or a similar use of *śāstrasiddha* in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's other works. However, the *paramāṇuparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaḥ* *vyākhyāyogāt* (rather than *āmalakaparimāṇāpekṣayotkarṣaviśeṣaḥ* *vyākhyāyogāt*) already strongly suggests that we do have a unique example here, and Thakur's proposal neither fits the lacuna nor, I should say, yields adequate sense.

52 *utkarṣa* and *prakarṣa* are used interchangeably; the former term is not used by Praśastapāda, but is found regularly in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's writings, e.g. *pracayaviśiṣṭam avayavatritvaṃ tathāvidhamahatvotkarṣapraitivīṣaya ity api na | apracitair apy adhikair ārabdhe pracitatrayārabdhe tulyamahatvotkarṣapraititēḥ* (GKT 58.9–11).

53 As remarked in footnote 51 above, *bilvāmalakadvyaṇukāder ekavāt* cannot mean 'because the dyad(s) and so on of a *bilva* and of an *āmalaka* are one:' that would be either false or irrelevant. What must be meant, therefore, is that the three things mentioned, *bilva*, *āmalaka* and dyad, are all things with regard to which one sometimes uses contradictory terms of size: the *āmalaka* may be called 'large' in the strict sense, but is also called 'atomic' (i.e. small, minute) in relation to

[One might ask:] How is there a contradiction between 'atomic' and 'large'? Therefore [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

And⁵⁴ because of [an] example. 7.1.22

Since we observe [the sizes atomic and large] only with mutual exclusion [inasmuch as] what is atomic is not large, like an atom;⁵⁵ what is large is not atomic, like ether. [there is indeed] a contradiction, just as there is of cold and warm touch.

That atomic size (*anūtvā*) and large size (*mahatva*) do not possess atomic size and large size is explained by motions and qualities (i.e. in the same way that motions and qualities are proved to be without motions and qualities).⁵⁶ 7.1.23

Motions and qualities are [explained to be] without [the] qualities [of atomic and large size] by atomic and large size (i.e. in the same way that atomic size and large size are shown to be without the qualities of atomic and large size).⁵⁷ 7.1.24

[In the form of a syllogism, the point made by *sūtra* 7.1.24 is as follows:] Quality and motion do not possess atomic size and/or large size, because [they are] not substance, like atomic size and large size.

By this perception and non-perception of long size (*dīrghatva*) and short size (*hrasvatva*) are explained as [being] permanent.⁵⁸ 7.1.25

the *bilva*. However, in all these cases it is one and the same the same *dharmin* which receives the two different designations, so the *virodhaparihāra* can not be by a difference in *dharmin*. As mentioned in the same footnote above, the occurrence of *dvyānuka* in this compound is one of the main points in support of the conjectural restoration of the commentary on 7.1.20.

54 The function of *ca* here is not made clear by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra.

55 The manuscript's *yathānuḥ* is clearly correct; the example is of an atom so that the masculine noun is required, not a neuter adjective. The choice for *anuḥ* rather than the more usual *para-mānuḥ* is perfectly understandable, and could be described as a somewhat playful use of words. Thakur's *yathānu* may have originated in an error in the transcript.

56 No commentary on this *sūtra* has been preserved.

57 Thakur takes this *sūtra* as part of the commentary on the *sūtra* *anuvamahatvābhyām karma-guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ* (Śaṅkara Miśra's 7.1.16), which he conjecturally adds. Candrānanda and the Ahmedabad manuscript, however, read as we do here, and the reading of the Trivandrum manuscript, *anuvamahatvābhyām karmmaguṇāt saguṇāḥ*, is most probably a corruption of the same text. Jambūvijaya and Nozawa have made the same decision. The reading of Śaṅkara Miśra's 7.1.16 is most probably secondary, as is suggested by the explicating *vyākhyātāḥ*, which is indeed to be supplied, in our text, by *anuvṛtti* from the preceding *sūtra*.

58 No commentary has been preserved on this *sūtra*, so unfortunately we have no confirmation for its reading and Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's interpretation of it. All other versions read simply *atena*

Motions by motions. 7.1.26

Qualities by qualities. 7.1.27

One must supply 'are explained' [in 7.1.26 and 7.1.27]. Motions and qualities of long size and short size are explained [as non-existent] by motions as examples and qualities as examples. [In the form of a syllogism:] Long size and short size do not possess motions, and also do not possess [qualities such as] white and so on, because they are not substances, like motions and like [qualities such as] white and so on.

This is impermanent. 7.1.28

'This,' [i.e.] the four kinds of size which are produced,⁵⁹ is 'impermanent' [i.e.] is destroyed. [If one asks:] 'What is the cause for the destruction [of the quality size]?' to this too this same [sūtra forms the] reply—'this (i.e. the locus of size, substance) is impermanent.' The word 'this' refers to substance as the locus of the four kinds of size which are effects. And therefore [, since the sūtra is to be read twice in this way,] the four kinds of size which are effects are destroyed through destruction of their locus; this is the meaning of the sūtra.

parimaṇḍalam (i.e. the size of atoms) is permanent. 7.1.29

The size of atoms is 'permanent' [i.e.] is not destroyed. [If one asks:] 'How [is this possible]?' to this too this same [sūtra forms the] reply—'*parimaṇḍalam* (i.e. an atom) is permanent.' [Here, in this second reading of the sūtra] *parimaṇḍalam* is that which possesses *parimaṇḍalam* (i.e. the size of an atom) [in other words] an

dirghatvahasvaive vyākhyāte, and this is also the reading in which the sūtra is quoted by Śaṅkara in the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad 2.2.11. In commenting on the sūtra Candrānanda begins by remarking *upalabdhyānupalabdhi mahatvānurvavat*, so it is conceivable that under the influence of such explanations the reading we find here entered the sūtra-text in Bhaṭṭa Vādi-ndra's recension. On the other hand, there are at least two other possibilities which cannot be excluded. First, the / a scribe might have changed the text of the sūtra under influence, conscious or unconscious, of 7.1.17 (see p. 112 above and footnote 42). More plausibly perhaps, one wonders if text has not dropped out here in the manuscript due to eyeskip, and if the original text (of the abridged version) did not have something like *etena dirghatvahasvaive vyākhyāte* (7.1.25) [*etenānurvamahatvopalabdhyānupaladhinā drṣṭāntena* (or something similar) *dirghatvahasvaivayor upalabdhyānupalabdhi nitye vyākhyāte*. I see no way to decide definitely between these three possibilities, and since, if the last alternative should be true, the exact wording of the commentary, especially the explanation of *etena*, is virtually impossible to recover, I have opted to let the manuscript reading stand, though not without grave misgivings.

⁵⁹ *utpādyam*, excluding the size of atoms, souls, ether, space and time and the internal organ.

atom.⁶⁰ Therefore the size of atoms is permanent because there is no destruction of [its] locus [the atom; this is the meaning of the sūtra].

False knowledge (*avidyā*) is the inferential mark of perfect knowledge (*vidyā*).⁶¹ 7.1.30

'False knowledge' [here means] memory of concomitance, [and such an interpretation is justified] because memory is [a form of] false knowledge.⁶² Perfect knowledge [here means] cognition of the being a property of the *pakṣa*.⁶³ One must supply the words 'of short size and atomic size.' [Thus the point made can be expressed in the form of a syllogism, as follows:] A dyad possesses a size in addition to that of atomic size [namely small size], because it is a substance, like a pot.⁶⁴

- 60 According to this second reading of the sūtra, *parimaṇḍala* here means an atom. Such a meaning is not given in any lexicographical work—Indian or European—which I have been able to consult, but I have noticed a passage where Akalaṅka appears to use the word in such a sense: his *parimaṇḍalādeḥ* is explained by Prabhācandra as a bahuvrīhi compound with the words *parimaṇḍalaḥ* (masculine!) *paramāṇuḥ ādir yasya* (*Nyāyakumudacandra* 484.18–19). From the point of view of grammar, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's second interpretation can be justified on the strength of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.2.127, *arśāddibhyo 'c*, which teaches that the *taddhiṭa* suffix *ac* may be applied in the sense of *matup* (from 5.2.94) to words in the *gaṇa* beginning with *arśas*. According to the almost unanimous grammatical tradition (the exceptions, according to the table on p. 10 of Birwé 1961, being Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's *Prakriyāsarvasva* and Rāmakṛṣṇa's *Gaṇapāṭha*) this is an *ākṛtigaṇa*; see e.g. the *Kāśikā* which comments *ākṛtigaṇaś cāyam* 'yatirā-bhinnarūpeṇa śabdena tadvato 'bhidhānam tat sarvam iha draṣṭavyam.
- 61 This is a particularly puzzling sūtra, and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is original and, to put it mildly, somewhat far-fetched. Thakur's addition of *ca* seems only to have been based on the fact that Śaṅkara Miśra reads thus: since the addition was silent, Jambūvijaya and Nozawa naturally assumed that the word was in the manuscript and have left it in the text. Candrānanda has no *ca*, however, and neither has either of our *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts.
- 62 This is a striking contradiction of Praśastapāda, who classifies *smṛti* among the four types of *vidyā*, not under *avidyā*; *vidyāpi caturvidhā, pratyakṣalaṅgikasmṛtyārśalakṣaṇā*. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra follows the later, chiefly Nyāya, division of *buddhi* into *anubhava* and *smṛti*, of which we find mention in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary: *buddhistham āropyate, sā ca buddhiḥ kvacit smṛtiḥ kvacid anubhavaḥ* (GKT 95.24–25).
- 63 I can make no sense out of the manuscript reading *pakṣaivapratītiḥ* which is retained by Thakur. Such an expression would be highly abnormal; *pakṣatva* is not a *dharma* of objects which can be cognized or overlooked, rather one speaks of the making something into the *pakṣa* (e.g. *pakṣīkaraṇa*) for a particular inference. Furthermore, one expects, if the abridger and the manuscript tradition have not mangled the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary too much, that the *pakṣa* spoken of is that in the following inference, and not some other syllogism which is withheld from us. And in that inference, the reading and sense of which is confirmed by the existence of parallels (cf. footnote 64 below), the dyad is the *pakṣa*, and short size and atomic size are two *pakṣadharmas* which possess *vyāpti*.
- 64 The unspoken presupposition of this inference is that all substances have more than one size; they are either atomic and small or large and long. Compare the parallel syllogisms given by

Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra in the GKT, *yathā hi gaganam dīrghatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇam dravya-
tvād iti gagane mahatvasiddhiḥ, evaṃ gaganam mahatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇam dravya-
tvād iti dīrghatvasiddhiḥ* | *yathā ca paramāṇur hrasvatvātiriktaparimāṇādhikaraṇam dravya-
tvād ghaṭavad iti paramāṇāv aṇutvasiddhiḥ, evaṃ paramāṇur aṇutvātiriktaparimāṇādhikara-
ṇam dravyatvād iti hrasvatvasiddhir api* (60.5-11).

In this, Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra departs from the position of Praśastapāda, whose *dīrghatvahrasyavate
coṭpādyamahadaṇutvaikārthasamavete* (131.2-3) should doubtless be taken as implying that
atoms and the all-pervading substances such as ether have only one size. The Praśastapādan
viewpoint seems however to have been abandoned long before Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra by most Vai-
śeṣikas: Vyomaśiva is the only commentator who takes the sentence just quoted at face value:
dīrghatvam ca hrasvatvam ceti dīrghatvahrasyavate | *te tūtpādya mahadaṇutvaikārthasamave-
te* | *utpādye ca te mahadaṇutve ca utpādyamahadaṇutve, tābhyām sahaikasmīn arthe sama-
vete* | *tathā hi tryaṇukādāv utpādyam mahatvam tatraiva dīrghatvam* | *dvyāṇuke cāṇutvam ta-
traiva hrasvatvam iti* | *paramāṇūnāṃ parimaṇḍalaṭvān na hrasvatvam, ākāśāder vyāpakatvāc
ca na dīrghatvam, tadviparīteṣu tadvyavahāradarśanāt* | (Vyo¹ 474.7-10, Vyo² vol. 2 152.10-
14, MS f. 129r1-3).

* *te tūtpādya*°: conj. Vyo², *hetūtpādya*° MS, *te coṭpādya*° Vyo¹.

Śrīdhara mentions both positions but is not explicit in committing himself to one of them:
*tatra paramāṇoḥ parimaṇḍalaṭvād dhrasvatvābhāvo vyāpakatvāc cākāśasya dīrghatvābhāva
ity eke* | *anye tu paramāṇuparamamahadvyavahārayaḥ paramahrasvatvaparamadīrghavyava-
hārasyāpi loke darśanāt paramāṇuṣu paramahrasvatvam paramadīrghatvam cākāśe ity āhuḥ* |
dīrghaparimāṇādhikaraṇam ākāśam, mahatparimāṇāśrayatvāt, stambhādīvat | *evaṃ hrasva-
parimāṇāśrayaḥ paramāṇuḥ, aṇuparimāṇāśrayatvāt, dvyāṇukavat* | (NK² 333.10-14). The
subcommentator Rājaśekharasūri explains *eke* in this passage as referring to Vyomaśiva—
correctly no doubt—and *anye* as representing Śrīdhara's own view (*ity eke iti vyomaśivapādāḥ* |
anye tv iti granthakāramataṃ | *ata evaitatsādhanāya prayogaḥ paramāṇuṣu paramadīrgha-
tvam cākāśa ity āhur iti* | NK² 333.19-20). In this latter identification he is supported by the
oldest of Śrīdhara's subcommentators, Naracandrasūri (d. A.D. 1231): *atha svamataṃ prakāśa-
yati 'anye tu' iti* (NK² 332.15), and this may indeed be correct, but it must be admitted that even
so Śrīdhara has expressed himself cautiously. Udayana, however, makes his opinion explicit,
and also attempts to read it into Praśastapāda's text, writing *ete nitye na sta iti kecit, tad asat* |
tathā hi mahatvam prakṛṣyamāṇam paramakūṣṭhām prāpnoti | *tathā dīrghatvam api prāpnu-
yāt* | *yathā cāṇutvam apakṛṣyamāṇam paramāṇukūṣṭhām prāpnoti tathā hrasvatvam api, upa-
patter ubhayatrāpi tulyatvāt* | *katham tarhi dīrghatvetyādiko granthaḥ* (i.e. the PDhS sentence
quoted above) | *satyam, nityānityabhedena mahatvāṇutvavat pratyekaṃ dīrghatvahrasyavate
yor dvaividhyam suprasiddham ekadeśaikīrtanena smārayati dīrghatveit* | *tathā ca paramadī-
rghatvaparamahrasvatve paramamahatvaparamāṇutvaikārthasamavete iti smartavyam iti hr-
dayam* | (KĀ 137.20-26). This is essentially Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's position, though his formu-
lations are not particularly similar to those of Udayana. Instead he may have been influenced
in wording by Vādivāgīśvara, who has *vivādādhyāsito* (scil. *paramāṇuḥ*) '*ṇuparimāṇavyati-
riktaparimāṇāśrayaḥ, dravyatvāt* | *vivādādhyāsito* (scil. *ākāśādīḥ*) *mahatparimāṇavyatirikta-
parimāṇāśrayaḥ, dravyatvāt, ghaṭavat paramāṇuvac ca* (Mānamanohara 63.3-5).

Finally, it should be perhaps mentioned here, in view of the position I ascribe to Praśastapāda,
that the summary of the *Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha* by Potter is quite mistaken in its interpreta-
tion of another, related, passage. Potter writes that '[y]ogis are endowed with the ability to tell
the minuteness of an atom from its shortness' (1977, 291), thus clearly implying that an atom
has both. But the passage referred to in fact has *atha tryaṇukādiṣu vartamāṇayor mahatva-
dīrghatvayor parasparataḥ ko viśeṣaḥ, dvyāṇukeṣu cāṇutvahrasyavayor iti* (131.18-20), with

Because of pervasion, ether is large, and so is the *ātman*. 7.1.31

Because it does not possess that (i.e. pervasion), the internal organ (*manas*) is atomic. 7.1.32

'Pervasion' [is] the simultaneous conjunction with all substances which have form. The word 'and' [in 7.1.31] is meant to include long size and so on, which are not [explicitly] mentioned. 'The internal organ (*manas*) is atomic,' because, while not having pervasion, it is a permanent substance, like an atom of water.

Space is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) qualities. 7.1.33

One must supply the words '[as] present everywhere and ultimately large.'⁶⁵

Time [is explained] by (i.e. in analogy with) the cause [, space, of notions of being further, nearer and so on, which time also can cause].⁶⁶ 7.1.34

Time is explained as present everywhere and ultimately large by (i.e. in analogy with) space [which like time is] the cause of notions of being further, nearer, earlier/eastern and so on.

Thus the first *āhnika* of the seventh *adhyāya*.

the latter question being answered *aṇutvahasvarvayostu parasparato viśeṣas taddarśināṃ pratyakṣa iti* (132.2–3). The fact that Praśastapāda asks the question with regard to dyads, not to atoms, is a clear and certain indication that the theory ascribed to him by Udayana and Potter is not in fact his.

⁶⁵ In view of the *ca* and the parallel in the commentary to 7.1.34 the emendation *sarvagata* for the *sarvagata*^o of the manuscript, retained by Thakur, appears certain.

⁶⁶ The interpretation apparently given of the sūtra seems somewhat odd, to say the least, but I do not think that the text is necessarily corrupt here.

Adhyāya 7, āhnikā 2

Because of [its] occurring separately from colour, taste, smell and touch, the number one¹ is a different object. 7.2.1

The number one is perceived in water and so on, even though there is no smell [therein], in fire and so on, even though there is no taste [therein], in the wind and so on, even though there is no colour [therein], [and] in ether and so on, even though there is no touch [therein]. Therefore it is different from colour and so on. In this way it should be proved that the number one is different from the other qualities and so on too.²

In the same way separateness. 7.2.2

Just as the number one is different from colour and so on, so separateness of a single thing (*ekapṛthaktva*) too [is different from colour and so on]. And [in this way] the number one and separateness of a single thing are established [as separate qualities], and [by analogy] numbers greater than one (*anekatva*) and separateness of many things (*anekapṛthaktva*) [are similarly established as separate qualities].³

Their permanence and non-permanence is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) the colour and touch of fire.⁴ 7.2.3

- 1 It will be noticed that there is a certain ambiguity in the word *ekatva* and that the text appears to use it in somewhat different meanings. In the main I translate it as 'the number one,' but there are places where one must obviously understand it as 'one-ness,' i.e. the being one.
- 2 The reading of the manuscript, *guṇāntarādibhyaḥ 'py ekatvasya bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ*, makes very good sense: the sūtra only explicitly mentions the first four qualities, but it is obviously important that the number one can also be shown to be distinct from the other qualities. Thakur's *guṇāntarādibhyaḥ anekatvasya bhedaḥ sādhanīyaḥ*, on the other hand, is puzzling: why would Bhaṭṭa Vādindra only explicitly refer to the number one's differing from the first four qualities and to other numbers' differing from all the others?
- 3 The text is somewhat suspect here, I think, but the intended sense must have been something along these lines.
- 4 Due to an unfortunate eyeskip, originating no doubt in the transcript, part of this sūtra was omitted in Thakur's edition, and the remaining words were taken by him as belonging to the commentary on the previous sūtra. This was probably under the influence of Śaṅkara Miśra, who does not know the sūtra. The resulting syntax is however suspicious, *tayor nityavānītyatve* as an independent sentence being quite untypical of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's style, and Jambūvijaya correctly concluded that the sūtra should be restored in agreement with Candrānanda's reading, which is incidentally also the reading we find in the two independent *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. Nozawa rejected this, and instead took *tayor nityavānītyatve tejaso rūpasparśauto* to be Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's reading—one which would be anomalous, for obviously the sense is not that the permanence and impermanence of the number one and of separateness are the colour and touch of fire, but rather that they are analogous to those qualities. The manuscript confirms Jambūvijaya's proposal and allows us to see how the error occurred.

And [their] arising.⁵ 7.2.4

Just as the colour and touch of fire⁶ are permanent in atoms and in other [i.e., compound, fire substances] are destroyed by the destruction of their locus, so the number one and separateness of a single thing [are permanent in atoms and in other loci are destroyed by the destruction of their locus]. And just as those (i.e. the colour and touch of fire) are, in an effect [substance], preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes [of the effect-substance], so also the number one and separateness of a single thing [in an effect substance are preceded by (i.e. caused by) the qualities of the causes of the effect substance].

The absence of the number one and separateness of a single thing in the number one and separateness of a single thing is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) atomic and large size.⁷ 7.2.5

Motions by motions. 7.2.6

Qualities by qualities. 7.2.7

The meaning of [these] sūtras has already been understood, because the method is the same.⁸

- 5 This sūtra was omitted in Thakur's edition owing to the same eyeskip which misled him with regard to the previous sūtra (see previous note). It was also not known to Śaṅkara Miśra: among other recensions, the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* also does not have it. Again, Jambūvijaya rightly conjectured that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra must have known it; again Nozawa rejected this conjecture: and again the manuscript shows Jambūvijaya to have been in the right.
- 6 Neither Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra nor any other ancient or modern authority appears to address the question why it is fire that is specifically mentioned here. It is of course clear that earth would not do, because it is a special case in that its qualities can be *pākaja* (cf. VS 7.1.5–7, 7.1.10–11 and 7.1.14–16 with commentary), and air would also be an unsuitable point of comparison, as it has no colour and is, in the Vaiśeṣika view, imperceptible despite possessing perceptible touch (cf. VS 4.1.7 = Candrānanda's 4.1.8). I see no particular reason, however, why water, which precedes fire in the standard order of substances, would not do equally well.
- 7 The manuscript reads *'ṇumahattvābhyām*, which is of course not impossible, and is retained by Thakur and, following him, Nozawa, although the other recensions (with the exception of the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript which omits the sūtra) have *'ṇutvamahattvābhyām* here. But in 7.1.23, 7.1.24 and 7.2.14—the last being a particularly exact parallel to our sūtra here—all recensions transmit the compound *aṇutvamahattva*, and inconsistency on this point seems very improbable to me. Therefore, like Jambūvijaya, I assume that the *iva* has been lost in transmission: this is only the first of a series of omissions of *akṣaras* and words which plagues the following section. The scribe was perhaps tired, and had several lapses of concentration. Note that in the commentary on 7.2.10 and in that on 7.2.11 the sense twice forces us to assume the same type of omission, that of a *iva* suffix within a compound (cf. footnotes 20 and 22 below). I.e. 7.2.6 and 7.2.7 are to be interpreted in analogy with the interpretation given at their earlier occurrence, as 7.1.26 and 7.1.27. 7.2.5 has not appeared before, but is parallel to 7.1.25 so that it is true that there is virtually nothing new to explain here.
- 8

Because motions and qualities do not have numbers, one-ness of everything does not exist. 7.2.8

The Illusionist-Vedāntins⁹ say that everything, quality, motion and so on,¹⁰ is one. That is not [correct], because one-ness of everything is contradicted. [In proof one may formulate a syllogism as follows:] Quality, motion and so on are devoid of the number one,¹¹ because they are not substance, [and] what is not thus is not thus,¹² like a pot.¹³

Since 'one' does not exist,¹⁴ [even] a metaphorical [one-ness] does not exist. 7.2.9

- 9 The expression *māyāvedāntin*, referring to proponents of Advaita Vedānta, is not one which I have met with in the works of other authors, nor does it appear to have been registered in any lexicographical work I have been able to consult. The sense is however perfectly clear, and the wording is confirmed by a reference to the *māyāvedāntasiddhānta* in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's full VS commentary (TS 67.14). Elsewhere Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra uses the more familiar *māyāvādin* (GKṬ 97.15 and 98.2).
- 10 Thakur's restoration of the lacuna has been rejected because there is clearly room for two or three more *akṣaras*. Another possibility might be *dravyaguṇakarmādikaṇ*, but *sarvaṃ guṇakarmādikaṇ* seems to fit better with Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's following refutation.
- 11 As the reader no doubt has already noticed, it is with a rather under-hand trick, hinging on the ambiguity of *ekaṇva*, that the monist position is here refuted. It must be said in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's defence that the wording of the sūtra itself suggests that some play on *ekaṇva* is going on. However it is perhaps not necessary to see the monists as the target of criticism here: Candrānanda does not seem to make such an association, introducing the sūtra with *nanu sarveṣām eva padārthānām ekaṇvam, sadaviśeṣāt* (58.1), nor does Śaṅkara Miśra do so.
- 12 I.e. that which is substance is not devoid of the number one.
There is a small problem in the precise wording of this syllogism. It is of course an inference of the *kevalavyatirekin* type, i.e., the *hetu* (here *adravyarva*) occurs nowhere but in the *pakṣa* (here all the categories except for substance). Such syllogisms are employed dozens of times in Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's writings (e.g. at GKṬ 31.9–10 or TS 66.13–14), and, as far as I can see, if a full syllogism is given it invariably employs the formula *na yad evaṃ na tad evaṃ*. Now here, though the manuscript does not preserve the passage completely, what the scribe wrote was almost certainly *yan naivaṃ na tad evaṃ*, a form which I do not find used elsewhere by Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra and cannot at present attest in the writings of other authors. Should we accept this variation of formula as authorial, or is it due to the abridger or a scribe?
Out of three possible practical decisions here, Thakur (or perhaps the transcriber) seems to me to have chosen the worst, altering the text to *yan naivaṃ tan naivaṃ*—a form found neither in the manuscript nor anywhere in the corpus of our author's works. Of the other two, letting the text stand as transmitted or emending to agree with Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's usage elsewhere, I have chosen for the latter. It seems to me that the *usus auctori* is well established on this point, and while I think that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra does sometimes deliberately vary his mode of expression, he is unlikely to do so in a 'formal' (or formular) syllogism.
- 13 The example too has been lost in the manuscript, but there is space for one, and since a substance is required, I follow Thakur in supplying *ghaṭavat*, the usual favourite. Of course it is possible that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra here used the second favourite, *paṭavat*, instead.
- 14 The commentary clearly supports the transmitted *ekasyābhāvād*. Note however that Candrā-

7.2.10

Effect and cause can not have the number one and separateness, because it is not possible that the number one²⁰ should reside in effect and cause which are not one, and because, as a quality, it is not possible that [the number one] should reside in a quality [and many effects and causes are qualities], and because it is also not possible that separateness, as a quality [too], should reside in quality and so on.²¹ By this difference and non-difference of universal and individual manifestation is also refuted.

This (i.e. numbers greater than one and multiple-separateness) is explained [as occurring in] two impermanent [substances]. 7.2.11

Numbers greater than one²² and multiple-separateness existing in two impermanent [substances] are explained, [that is to say, it is explained] that (*iti*) [they] are destroyed through destruction of their locus.²³

Conjunction [is of three kinds:] arising from motion of either of the two [substances which have conjunction], arising from motion of both [substances] and arising from conjunction. 7.2.12

[Conjunction] which arises from motion of either of the two [substances is that of a substance with form but] without motion with [a substance] which has motion, such

neuter singular.

- 20 The sense clearly requires *ekatvāsyā* here, not *ekasyā* as is transmitted by the manuscript, which Thakur follows in this. The same type of error was apparently made by the scribe in 7.2.5 and in the commentary on 7.2.11; see footnotes 7 and 22.
- 21 A substantial part of the argumentation here was missing in Thakur's text, having been probably omitted in the transcript as a result of eyeskip between two occurrences of ° *papaṭṭeḥ*.
- 22 Yet again the scribe must have omitted the abstract *iva* here (cf. footnotes 7 and 20 above); this time Thakur made the necessary correction.
- 23 It seems fairly clear how Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra understands the sūtra; *anekatvaṃ anekaprāthaktvaṃ ca* must correspond to *etat*, and since *āśrayanāśān naśyati* is clearly meant as an explication of *vyākhyātam*, the *varṣamānam* should not be taken with *vyākhyātam* but must be intended to make clear how Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra understands the locative *anītyayoḥ*. Candrānanda, however, reads and interprets the sūtra altogether differently. His reading is *etad anītyanītyayoḥ vyākhyātam*, and on this he comments *etat pūrvasūtram anītyaviśayam api nītyeṣv ākāśādiṣu yathāsam-bhavaṃ vyākhyātam boddhavyam | tathā hi—śabdākāśayoḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ naikatvaṃ nāpi prāthaktvaṃ* (58.13–14). Candrānanda is alone in reading the sūtra in this way, both independent *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts supporting Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's reading, which is also followed by Śaṃkara Miśra. The latter, however, has yet another interpretation, the direction of which may be seen from the opening of his commentary on the sūtra: *anītyayoḥ saṃkhyāprāthaktvayoḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvakatvaṃ yad vyākhyātam tad anītyayoḥ ekatvaikapraṭhaktvayoḥ eva boddhavyam* (318.3–4).

as of a post with a falcon,²⁴ and of all-pervading [substances] with [substances] which have form.²⁵ [Conjunction] which arises from motion of both [substances is that of two substances] with opposing motion, such as of two wrestlers or of two rams;²⁶ for [in these cases] the motions of both substances are causes of the conjunction as no difference [as to their motion] is perceived in them. And [conjunction] which arises from conjunction²⁷ is twofold—[conjunction] which arises from the conjunction of the [material] causes [of the conjunction] and that which arises from the conjunction of a [material] cause and something which is not a [material] cause [of the new conjunction].²⁸ The first is, for example, [when] from the motion of a thread a conjunction with another thread arises, from which a conjunction [arises in the first thread] with the [particular part of] ether and so on which is conjoined with the other thread. [This type sometimes also arises]

- 24 The standard example, given also by Praśastapāda (cf. the following note) and e.g. Candrānanda on this sūtra (7.2.10 in the recension he follows).
- 25 The sentence *anyatarakarmajaḥ kriyāvatā niṣkriyasya, yathā sthāṇoḥ śyenena, vibhūnām ca mūrtaiḥ* is, though not indicated as such, a quotation from the PDhS where it is preceded by a partitive *atra* (139.19–21).
- 26 This is almost identical with another sentence in the PDhS, where *ubhayakarmajo viruddhakriyayoh* is however followed by the additional word *saṃnipātaḥ* (139.21–22). The examples are again standard, oft repeated ones.
- 27 Obviously the *saṃyogaś ca* of the manuscript is wrong, but I have preferred a more economical emendation than Thakur, who added *saṃyogajo*. This renders the *saṃyogaś (ca)* redundant and anomalous, while the word-order also strikes me as a little suspicious. Nor does such a reading explain the error any more easily, as it cannot be attributed to either a homoeoteleuton or a homoeoarcton (which would result in simply *saṃyogajo*). Instead, I believe that the scribe skipped over a single syllable, through no particular graphical cause, as he clearly did in several places in this particular section of the manuscript. Exactly the same mistake was made in the text of the sūtra itself, where the scribe wrote *ubhayakarmmas* for *ubhayakarmajas*, and again later in this same sentence, where he wrote *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogaś ca* for *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogajaś ca*; in both cases Thakur makes the necessary emendation.
- 28 In contrast to the preceding two kinds of conjunction, in explaining which Bhaṭṭa Vādindra remained (even verbally) faithful to Praśastapāda's account in the PDhS, we find in this two-fold division of *saṃyogajasam̐yoga* an idea which may be original to our author. In the PDhS, *saṃyogajasam̐yoga* is taught to be a *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogapūrvakaḥ kāryākāryagataḥ saṃyogaḥ* (140.1–2), and from the examples given it is sufficiently clear that with *kāraṇākāraṇasaṃyogapūrvakaḥ* Praśastapāda indeed means 'caused by conjunction between causes and non-causes.' This therefore appears to correspond to Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's second type. The only division of *saṃyogajasam̐yoga* mentioned by Praśastapāda is according to whether it arises from a single conjunction, two or many (PDhS 140.2–6). The motivation for Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's innovation (if it is indeed his), must have been the desire to make conjunction even more parallel in its classification with disjunction, in the case of which all writers admit a similar sub-division of *vibhāgajavibhāga* (cf. the commentary on 7.2.13 below). The idea does not however seem to be free of problems (see the following footnote), and it does not surprise me much that I have been able to find no trace of it so far in the writings of later authors.

from two [conjunctions of causes], for example, the conjunction of a substance consisting of two threads with ether which [arises] from the two conjunctions of [the individual] threads with ether.²⁹ The second [type of conjunction arising from conjunction], on the other hand, is for example the conjunction of the body with a wall [which arises] from the conjunction of the hand with the wall.

'And' [in this way] conjunction is of three kinds—[here, in the sūtra,] the word 'and' is used in the sense of restriction (i.e. it indicates that there are exactly three kinds of conjunction and no more).

If [an opponent claims that there is] an unproduced (i.e. eternal) conjunction of all-pervading substances [which is a] fourth [kind of conjunction, we reply]:³⁰ No,

29 The examples Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra gives here are puzzling, and raise the problem of what he means by the distinction he makes. In the first case, the conjunction which functions as the cause is between two threads, A and B, of which it is A that has moved towards B, so that this is a conjunction of the *anyatarakarmaja* variety. The conjunction which is said to arise from this is a conjunction of A with the all-pervading substances which are conjoined with B, i.e. with the part of those substances which occupies the same space as B. Now A is the material cause of the new conjunction, but B is not a material cause either of A or of A's new conjunction, so the latter would normally (i.e. in Praśastapāda terminology) be considered one which is *kāraṇākāraṇa-saṃyogaja*. In the second case the two conjunctions of threads A and B with ether (and so on) cause the conjunction of the larger compound substance AB with ether. Here neither A nor B is a (material) cause of AB's conjunction, but they are of AB itself. But the cause-conjunctions are both with ether, and in each case with a part of ether which is not equivalent to the part of ether that is one of the loci of the conjunction that they produce, so this seems even less strictly *kāraṇa-saṃyogaja*. In fact it is not clear to me how this second example differs from the following example of *kāraṇākāraṇa-saṃyogaja saṃyoga*.

30 The notion of an unproduced, eternal, conjunction (*aja saṃyoga*) of eternal substances is already mentioned and rejected by Praśastapāda in the PDhS, in a discussion beginning with the *vārtika*-style sentence *nāsty ajah saṃyogo nityaparimaṇḍalavat prthag anabhidhānāt* (140.19–20). Praśastapāda goes on to say that the conjunction of atoms with the all-pervading substances such as ether is in fact only located at a particular part of the all-pervading substance concerned and is of the *anyatarakarmaja* type (the motion being of course that of the atoms, for ether and so on cannot move): *paramāṇubhir ākāśādīnāṃ pradeśavṛttir anyatarakarmajah saṃyogah* (141.3–4). And nor is there an unproduced mutual conjunction of the all-pervading substances: they are not conjoined at all, and the reason given for this is that they lack *yutasiddhi* (on which cf. 7.2.17 and the commentary thereon below).

Though Frauwallner comments on the philosophical importance of the rejection of *aja saṃyoga* (1956, 224–25), neither he nor Praśastapāda himself nor his commentators gives any clue as to the identity of the thinkers who proposed the existence of this fourth type of conjunction. Bhāsarvajña clearly refers to Praśastapāda's rejection of this type of conjunction and offers a defence, writing *yutasiddhyabhāvan nāsti vibhūnām saṃyoga ity ayuktam, hetor asiddharvāt | pramāṇasiddhaś ca vibhūnām saṃyogah | tathā hi—ākāśena saṃyukta ātmā, śarīrasaṃyuktatvāt, bhūtalavat* (NBhū 170.13–15). Mishra (1987, 47–48) is thus not unjustified in listing the difference of opinion with regard to *aja saṃyoga* as one of the points distinguishing Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, though I am not sure that all Naiyāyikas would be unanimous on the subject, and the only text passages he refers to (from the *Vyomavātī* and the *Nyāyakandalī* on this PDhS passage) do not really suffice to demonstrate his point. He does not however mention that argu-

for there is no proof [for the existence of this type of conjunction]. If [the opponent adduces as proof the syllogism:] two all-pervading substances are mutually conjoined, because they are substances, like a pot, [we reply]: No, for the [logical ground in this syllogism] deviates with regard to threads and a cloth and so on.³¹ If [the opponent tries to improve his syllogism by saying that] it is to be further qualified by [adding] 'when there is no relationship of produced and producer' [we reply]: No, for [the logical ground still] deviates with regard to the Himalaya and the Vindhya [mountain ranges] and so on, in which [mutual] conjunction has not [ever] arisen,³² and³³ with regard to a cloth and so on which has been destroyed.³⁴

By (i.e. in analogy with) this (i.e. conjunction) disjunction is explained.

7.2.13

Like conjunction, disjunction too [is of three kinds]: disjunction³⁵ which arises from motion of either of the two [substances, [that] which arises from motion

ments for this fourth type of conjunction are also to be found in some Mīmāṃsā works; thus the *Nyāyaratnamālā* of the great Bhaṭṭa Mīmāṃsaka writer Pārthasārathi Miśra gives the following: *tathāpy ajaḥ saṃyogo vibhūnor bhaviṣyaty anumānāt—vibhūnī dravye mīṭhaḥ saṃyukte, dravyatve sati nirantaravāi, ghaṭākāśavad iti* (327.18–20; the context is a discussion about the type of contact involved in the perception of sound). Similarly the (also Bhaṭṭa) *Mānameyodaya* first divides conjunction into permanent and non-permanent (*nitya* and *anitya*) and then further subdivides the latter into the three types accepted by the Vaiśeṣika: the permanent type, which is taught to be the mutual conjunction of permanent and all-pervading substances such as ether and time, corresponds of course to the *aja saṃyoga* of the earlier writers (see *Mānameyodaya* 250.8–251.6).

The Prābhākaras seem however to differ from the Bhaṭṭas on this point: at least the only explicit statement I have noticed, in Jaipuri Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa's commentary *Nyāyasiddhi* on the *Prakaraṇapañcikā*, briefly describes conjunction in words almost identical with those of Prāśastapāda as *aprāptayoḥ prāptiḥ saṃyogaḥ | so 'nyatarakarmajaḥ, ubhayakarmajaḥ, saṃyoga-jaś ceti trividhaḥ* (158.1–2).

31 The threads are related to the cloth formed out of them by *samavāya*, the cloth inhering in the threads, and not by conjunction.

32 The economical emendation of *adutpannasamnyoge* to *anulpannasamnyoge* appears to me to yield acceptable sense. I do not quite understand Thakur's *utpannasamnyoge*: presumably he means this to go with *naṣṭapaṭāḍau*.

33 Conjecturing loss of a *ca* due to yet another *lapsus oculi*; clearly two examples are given.

34 What Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra says here is that even if the opponent reformulates the syllogism intended to prove the existence of an unproduced conjunction of all-pervading substances in the following way—*vibhū mīṭhaḥ saṃyujyete, ārabhyārambhakabhāvavirahe sati dravyavāi, ghaṭavat*, the inference remains invalid, for there exist cases where the *hetu* is present without the *sādhyadharma* also being present. One such is that of the Himālaya and the Vindhya mountain ranges: both are substances, and they are not related as producer and produced (as the thread and cloth are), yet they never have been and never will be conjoined. Another counter-example is a cloth which has already been destroyed: there are infinite substances which are not related to it as producer and produced but which will never have been conjoined with it.

35 The final *vibhāgaḥ* in the manuscript is somewhat redundant. Nonetheless I retain it, unlike Tha-

of both [substances] and [that] which arises from disjunction. The first is for example³⁶ [that] of a post with a falcon. The second is for example [that] of two wrestlers. [And there is disjunction which arises] from disjunction of the causes alone, such as the disjunction of a section of bamboo³⁷ from ether and so on [which arises] from the disjunction of [two] bamboo sections,³⁸ [and finally] there is disjunction which arises from disjunction of a cause and a non-cause, such as the disjunction of a body and a wall [which arises] from the disjunction of a finger from the wall and [the resulting] disjunction of a hand from the wall: this [is the meaning of the sūtra] (*iti*).

The absence of conjunction and disjunction in conjunction and disjunction is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) atomic size and large size.
7.2.14

Motions by motions. 7.2.15

Qualities by qualities. 7.2.16

The meaning of these three sūtras has already been understood.³⁹

Because [they] are not established as connected, conjunction and disjunction of effect and cause do not exist. 7.2.17

'Establishing as connected' (*yutasiddhi*) is the establishing that two things are connected, [i.e.] in conjunction; [in other words] the cognizing that two things are in conjunction.⁴⁰ Because this is not present, there are no conjunctions between that

kur, judging it to be possibly authorial. Its function, if one can speak of one, is to increase the parallelism with the wording of 7.2.12. It can not be ruled out that it is scribal, but the increased carelessness of the scribe in this part of the text seems to manifest itself mostly in omission of *akṣaras* and words, rather than their addition. Nor can such an addition be explained as dittography. It does remain possible, of course, that the word was added by a scribe at some earlier point in the transmission of the text.

36 It seems most unlikely that Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra should have omitted the *yathā* in this case, so I assume yet another careless slip by the scribe here.

37 'Bamboo' may not be botanically accurate, but the important thing is that *vaṃśa* is some bamboo- or cane-like plant with a hard stalk, and *dala* not so much a leaf as a section of the stalk (it is sometimes paraphrased by *parva*). These occur in a standard example for *vibhāga-ja śabda*, see for instance Uddyotakara's *vaṃśadalavibhāgānugṛhītād vaṃśadalākāśavibhāgāc chabda iti* (NV 199.22–23).

38 Essentially the same example is given by Vallabhācārya in the *Nyāyalīlāvāṭī*: *sphuṭadveṇu-śabdāc ca vibhāgo 'vagamyate | ... sa ca vibhāgajaḥ yathā vaṃśadalapāṇānāntaram kriyayā vaṃśadalayor vibhāgaḥ, tataś ca nabhobhāgavibhāgaḥ* (851.3–852.1).

39 See footnote 8 on p. 122 above.

40 This definition is completely different from that given by Praśastapāda; *sā* (i.e. *yutasiddhi*) *pu-nar dvayor anyatarasya vā prthaggatimatvaṃ yutāśrayasamavāyitvaṃ ceti* (PDhS 141.6–7).

which is produced and that which produces it. If [it is objected that] there is [at least] a cognition of a connection [between that which is produced and that which produces it], [we reply:] Then let there be a connection, but this [connection] is inherence [and not conjunction]. [To put it in the form of a syllogism:] This cloth is not conjoined with this thread, because it is produced by it (i.e. the thread), like the colour of a thread. And since there is no conjunction, there is [also] no disjunction which would destroy the [conjunction].

And because [they] are qualities. 7.2.18

The colour and so on of the cloth do not possess conjunction and disjunction,⁴¹ because they are qualities, like conjunction.

[Someone may object:] 'But there is a connection between what is expressed and [the word] that expresses it.' Therefore [the sūtrakāra] says—

[A word which expresses something] is also spoken with reference to a quality. 7.2.19

Not only is the [word] which expresses something a quality, it is also spoken with reference to a quality, [i.e.] used by convention with regard to white and so on. Therefore since both what is expressed and [the word] which expresses it are qualities, they cannot possess conjunction and disjunction.

[And also] neither of them possesses going,⁴²

At a later place Praśastapāda repeats the definition and clarifies it slightly: *sā punar dvayor anyatarasya vā prthaggatimatvam | iyaṃ tu nityānām | anityānām tu yuteṣu āśrayeṣu samavāyo yutasiddhir iti* (PDhS 152.10–12). Candrānanda is very close to Praśastapāda in the wording of his definition: on the same sūtra we are now dealing with, numbered 7.2.14 in his text, he writes *yutasiddhir dvayor anyatarasya vā prthaggatimatvam | sā ca nityayoḥ, yutāśrayasamavetatvam cānityayor yathā ghaṭapataḥ tvagindriyapārthivaśarīrayoś ca* (59.7–8). In short, while Bhaṭṭa Vādindra clearly takes *yuta* as derived from (1) √yu 'to unite,' the others understand it as derived from (2) √yu 'to separate' (cf. e.g. Whitney 1885, 131–132).

41 Thakur corrects the *paṭarūpādayogavibhāgavantaḥ* of the manuscript to *paṭarūpādayo na vibhāgavantaḥ*, but I see no reason why *vibhāga* should be singled out here. The sūtra continues the discussion begun in 7.2.17, in which both *saṃyoga* and *vibhāga* are mentioned, and in the commentary on the following sūtra, 7.2.19, Bhaṭṭa Vādindra continues to treat both qualities as the subject of the argument. If anything, *saṃyoga* is the more crucial quality, in the light of the subsequent discussion of the connection between word and object. I therefore suspect that we have another scribal carelessness here, caused this time by eyeskip between two occurrences of a *yo*.

42 The conjecture *ubhayor gamanaṃ nāsti* is the best I can do here, and it is not unlikely to be correct, although there may be other possibilities. Thakur's *ubhayor gaṇyabhāvāt* fits ill as an *avataṛaṇa* to 7.2.20: it is only rendered coherent in the text he presents by his (causeless, as far as I can see) transposition of 7.2.20 to follow directly on 7.2.19. Not only is there no justification for this in the manuscript, it is intrinsically somewhat improbable. Admittedly Bhaṭṭa Vādindra frequently groups sūtras together, but not without there being better reason for this than I think we have here.

Because they do not possess motion. 7.2.20

[For] first of all a word such as 'Himālaya' [when] uttered in the Deccan does not go up to the Himālaya. Nor does the Himālaya and so on go to the word 'Himālaya' and so on which was uttered in the Deccan and stay there,⁴³ because of the fault of non-perception of something which is capable [of being perceived]. And sound, as well as ether and so on, does not have motion, so [in short] how can these have conjunction?

[The *sūtrakāra*] sums up [the discussion by saying]—

Word and object have no connection.⁴⁴ 7.2.21

Supply 'therefore.'

[To object that we do have a qualified cognition of e.g. a person] through a staff which has conjunction [with him] and [a qualified cognition of a cow] through a horn which has inherence [in it]⁴⁵ [, and that therefore, similarly, word and object are connected]: [this]⁴⁶ is not a [valid] logical ground⁴⁷ because [in those cases (?) a real connection (?) is seen [but in the case of word and object it is not].⁴⁸

7.2.22

43 There is a rather large lacuna here, which I have conjecturally restored in a fashion which I believe yields good sense, is stylistically acceptable and accounts for all the legible *akṣaras*. The preparer of Thakur's transcript probably did not try hard enough here: he seems to have failed to read the *akṣara* before and the one after the lacuna, for Thakur prints *daṣṣiṇāpathoccāri-tahimavadādi[bhiliḥ samam samyujya]nte*. This is incidentally also syntactically improbable; the *samam* (*sam-√yuj*) is unnecessary and odd, and has no parallel that I can see in Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's writings.

44 It is not improbable that *asambandhau* is a scribal error for *asambaddhau*, as read by Candrānanda. However the manuscript reading is interpretable, and Śaṅkara Miśra also appears to have read *asambandhau*.

45 Taking *samyoginaḥ* and *samavāyinaḥ* as ablatives agreeing with *daṇḍāt* and *viṣṇāṇāt* respectively, rather than as genitives, as might also be possible. Nothing can be said with certainty about Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's intentions on this point, but Candrānanda is explicit: *samyogisamavāyibhyāṃ daṇḍaviṣṇāṇābhyāṃ daṇḍiviṣṇāṇinoḥ pratyayo dṛṣṭaḥ* (60.3).

46 Understanding as if there were an *iti* in the text: the same is necessary in, for instance, 6.1.2 (cf. footnote 8 above). Candrānanda reads this as two *sūtras*, and prefaces the second, *dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ* (7.2.21 in his text) with *naitat* (60.5). As my translation shows, I suspect that Bhaṭṭa Vādindra also understands *dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ* as an answer to an opponent's argument, though unfortunately the commentary as it survives here is far from being completely clear.

47 There is, I think, insufficient reason to emend by adding *pratyayaḥ* to agree with Candrānanda's reading.

48 The interpretation and therefore translation of this *sūtra* is quite uncertain, particularly with regard to the word *dṛṣṭatvāt*. Candrānanda interprets his 7.2.21 as follows: *daṇḍiviṣṇāṇinoḥ dṛṣṭatvād adōṣaḥ, iha tu śabdārthayoḥ sambandhasyoktanyāyenādṛṣṭatvād ahetur arthapratyayaḥ sambandhe* (60.7–8): 'Since [the man] with the staff and [the cow] with the horn are [actually]

In [cognitions] such as 'The cow has a horn' the fact that [this is] a cognition of [something as] qualified is inconclusive [and therefore not a valid logical ground].⁴⁹

Because there is no such cognition.⁵⁰ 7.2.23

seen [as such], there is no fault [in claiming that in those cases the fact that seeing one thing can produce a cognition of another thing as qualified by the former proves the existence of a real connection between the two]. In this case, however, because according to the principle that has already been taught [in C's 7.2.15–18] we do not see a connection between word and object, the cognition of an object [from hearing the word associated therewith] is not a [valid] logical ground for [the inference of] a [real] connection.* See also the following footnote.

* Houben, in translating C's 7.2.21 'following Candrānanda's version as well as his commentary' gives the following rendering (1992, 73): '[The answer is: This is not so.] Because [the staff- and horn-bearer or their relations] are observed, [there is no fault in those cases. But here, because the relation of *śabda* and *artha* is not observed in accordance with the mentioned rule,] the understanding [of the *artha*] is without cause [as far as the relation is concerned].' On one significant point this interpretation is probably unacceptable: the rendering of *ahetuḥ* as a bahuvrīhi adjective qualifying *pratyayaḥ*. This simply does not yield good sense—note that Houben's '[as far as the relation is concerned], rendering Candrānanda's *sambandhe*, does not succeed in improving this. It is hardly the Vaiśeṣika's intention to say that the understanding of an object from hearing the word associated with it is 'without a cause [as far as a relation is concerned], rather what is said is that contrary to what the opponent argues in the previous sūtra, the fact that one understands an object from a word does not prove that the two are connected (or 'related,' in Houben's terminology, which I think less happy)—see the last bit of Candrānanda's commentary on the preceding sūtra, his 7.2.20, *asti ca śabdād arthapratyayaḥ tasmād asyāpi sambandho 'stīti* (60.3–4; this is rendered accurately enough by Houben, op. cit. loc. cit.). Rather than 'without cause,' *ahetu* means 'a non-*hetu*,' in other words something which is not a valid inferential mark. That this usage is the normal one may be demonstrated, if that is necessary, by adducing the sole other occurrence of the word in Candrānanda's commentary: ad 3.1.10, *aprasiddho 'napadeśaḥ*, he glosses *anapadeśaḥ* with *ahetuḥ*. The context of the entire passage makes unambiguously clear that the topic being discussed is what is a valid inferential mark and what is not. Cf. similarly *alingam* in (C's) 2.1.21.

- 49 The commentary is all too brief here, but from the little to go on I propose that what is meant by 'inconclusive' is that one may have cognitions of something as qualified without there being a real connection by *saṃyoga* or *samavāya*. In that case, perhaps Bhaṭṭa Vādindra understands the opponent as saying: 'We have the notion that word and object are connected, and therefore they are connected by *saṃyoga* or *samavāya*, just as we have the notion that a cow has a horn (i.e. is connected with a horn) and it is clear that it indeed does,' and replies to this: 'But the fact that one has a cognition of something as qualified (i.e. connected) does not allow such a conclusion, for one may have such cognitions without either of those two relations being present.' If asked for an example, he might perhaps have adduced cognitions such as *caturviṃśatir guṇāḥ* or *putravān devadattāḥ*.

This interpretation requires of course that *sambandha* be interpreted as '*saṃyoga* or *samavāya*.' What remains particularly unclear is how Bhaṭṭa Vādindra interprets *dr̥ṣṭavāt* in the sūtra.

- 50 There is apparently no commentary preserved on this cryptic sūtra, which could also be taken differently. Thus Candrānanda (Śaṅkara Miśra does not have the sūtra) clearly reads as two words, *tathā pratyayābhāvaḥ*, commenting as follows: *yadi śabdo 'rthera sambaddhaḥ syād aghṛītasanketo 'pi tato 'rtham pratipadyeta | tasmād asambaddhau* (60.10–11). 'If it were the

[And because there may be a] doubt.⁵¹ 7.2.24

Having put forward the thesis that [cognitions are] preceded by (i.e. caused by) connection, if a qualified cognition occurs⁵² there would be a doubt: 'Is [the cognition of something as qualified] preceded by (i.e. caused by) a connection or not?'⁵³ [It

case that word is connected with object then even a man who has not grasped (i.e. learned) the [linguistic] agreements/conventions would have cognition of the object from it (i.e. the word). [But this is not the case:] therefore [word and object] are not connected.' An attempt to translate the sūtra in accordance with this commentary would yield something like 'And (*tathā*) there is no cognition [of the object from hearing the word in the case of someone unfamiliar with the relevant linguistic convention].' For another translation, not radically different, see Houben 1992: 74.

In the light of what I tentatively propose as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's interpretation of the previous sūtra (see the previous footnote), however, I have deviated from this understanding of 7.2.23, the only one which is accessible to us, since ŚM does not have the sūtra. I suggest that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra may have understood this as a second answer to the opponent's argument for a real connection between word and object; we do not actually have cognitions of word and object as connected in the same way that we do of a cow and its horn.

Thakur recognized neither this sūtra nor the next as sūtras. Jambūvijaya did, but takes them together as a single sūtra, and is followed in this by Nozawa. Candrānanda however has two, though the second does not agree exactly with the reading we have here of 7.2.24 (see the following footnote), and I see nothing in our commentary which suggests that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra read the sūtras as one. Instead, I am afraid that the entire commentary on this sūtra has been either omitted by the abridger or lost in transmission.

- 51 Candrānanda reads this sūtra *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*, and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript has *sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ* and the Trivandrum one *sambandhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*, while Śaṅkara Miśra does not know it. It is perhaps conceivable that the . . . *pratiñāya* construction in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is a paraphrase of an . . . *iti cet* and that something should be supplied in the sūtra-text, but if so the missing words can hardly be the same as in any of the other versions: something like *sambandhād iti cet* would be possible. On the whole though, it seems to me that there are insufficient grounds for such a conjecture.
- 52 My reconstruction here, *yadī viśiṣṭapratyayaḥ syāt*, is no doubt far from certain, but fits fairly well with what is preserved in the manuscript and yields natural syntax. Thakur's [*hetor viśiṣṭapratyayasyo[ktau]*] is syntactically unobjectionable but is clearly very different from what was written by the scribe.
- 53 The line of thought here is difficult to reconstruct. If the text has been constituted correctly, perhaps Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra means something like this: if the cognition of an object that one has on hearing a certain word is caused by a connection between the two, what about cases where the resultant cognition is itself one of the object as qualified by another one? For instance if we hear the word *daṇḍī* and have a cognition of a man with a staff, is there really somewhere a particular staff connected with (i.e. in the hand of) a man with whom the word has a direct connection? This argument seems to me to be in itself a possible one, but I am far from being certain that it is really what Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra had in mind here. We may briefly examine the interpretation found in Candrānanda's commentary, although, as mentioned in footnote 51 above, his reading is different—namely *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ*. The commentary runs *nanu śabdenākāśaṃ sambaddham, ākāśena cārthaḥ | evaṃ sambaddhasambandhād arthena sam-*

might be objected: If word and object are not connected] how then [is it possible that] from the word 'Devadatta' a cognition with regard to Devadatta [arises] and not [one] with regard to Yajñadatta? Therefore [the *sūtrakāra*] says—

The cognition of an object through a word is conventional. 7.2.25

'Conventional' means established by convention (*saṃaya*). [And] 'convention' [means] an agreement (*saṃketa*). A word which is used by agreement (*saṃketyate*) with regard to a particular object creates [when it is used] a cognition⁵⁴ of that [object alone] and not of another. Thus through agreement there is restriction (*niyama*); this [is what the *sūtra* intends to express] (*iti*).

Far[ness] and near[ness] [arise] from two [objects] which are in the same direction [or] time⁵⁵ and which are close (*sannikṛṣṭa*) or distant

bandha iti | naitat, sarvārthānām ākāśena sambandhāt kasminn arihe śabdah prayukta iti saṃ-
dehād apratipatīḥ syāt | ato na sambandhaḥ (60.13–15).

* *sambaddhasambandhād*: conj. Jambūvijaya, *sambandhasambandhād* MSS.

'Objection: [even if word and object are not directly connected] ether is connected with the word [as the word inheres in ether] and the object [is connected by conjunction] with ether. [so] in this way [the word] is connected with the object through a "connection to the connected." This is not [correct]: [for if it were], since all objects are connected with ether [one] would [have a] doubt: in regard to which object the word was used, and therefore there would be no ascertainment [of the intended object]. Therefore there is no connection [even of such an indirect type, between word and object].'

Given the reading he has, this looks plausible enough as an interpretation of the *sūtra*. It seems to me, however, that it may be ruled out that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's understanding of the *sūtra* was even vaguely similar. One might note, incidentally, that against such a theory as Candrānanda thinks is put forward here as a *pūrvapakṣa* another objection would have been possible: an indirect connection may exist in the case of normal *mūrti* substances, but according to the Vaiśeṣikas there is no conjunction between the all-pervading substances (cf. p. 127 above and footnote 30 thereon), so there would be no connection between, for example, the word *kāla* and the substance time.

† For another translation of the same passage see Houben 1992, 72. Aside from the English terminology, there is no real difference in our understanding of the passage (although Houben omits translating the last sentence, apparently through an oversight).

54 The manuscript reading, *prayāyakam*, fits perfectly here, while Thakur's *prayojakam* is incoherent. I assume it springs from an error by the transcriber.

55 Retaining the manuscript reading *ekadikkālābhyām*, which also is found in Candrānanda's recension and the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts. Thakur reads *ekadikkābhyām*, presumably, if it does not originate from the transcript, under influence of the same reading in Śaṅkara Miśra's version. In favour of this choice is certainly the fact that the commentary on this *sūtra* does not speak of time or farness and nearness with regard to time. But I am inclined to put this down to loss of text in the process of abridging or that of transmission. Note that farness and nearness in time are referred to in the commentary on the following, related *sūtra*, and there is no apparent reason why they should be only introduced there.

(viprakṛṣṭa).⁵⁶ 7.2.26

Farness and nearness arise from two [objects] which are located in one direction [, for instance] in the east or the west, [and which] are, with respect to one's own body, conjoined by a large or small number of conjunctions with the conjoined (*saṃyukta-saṃyoga*).⁵⁷ The usage of the words 'far' and 'near,' which express qualities, with reference to a substance, in [sentences or cognitions such as] 'the cloth is far,' 'the cloth is near' is caused by connection [of the substance] with the qualities far and near [respectively].

Through farness of the cause and through nearness of the cause. 7.2.27

The cause of farness and nearness is enumerative cognition (*apekṣābuddhi*). 'Farness' of this [*apekṣābuddhi*]⁵⁸ means its] having as its object a large number of

56 Thakur adds a *ca*, not in the manuscript, at the end of this sūtra, probably in order to make it agree with ŚM's reading. Candrānanda and the Ahmedabad *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript do not have the word.

57 Here we have a lacuna not caused by damage to the manuscript; the scribe has left a small space open between °*bhūya* and *yasva*°. Thakur's °*bhūyastvābhūyastva*° is acceptable as far as sense goes, but the wording is far likelier to have been °*bhūyastvālpīyastva*°. Unlike the formulation for which Thakur has chosen, this one is widely found in the texts of the school, including at least one occurrence in the Bhaṭṭa Vādindra corpus; in his commentary on the section dealing with farness and nearness in the *Kiraṇāvalī* a *pratīka* is introduced with the words *nanu parāparavayavahārayoḥ saṃyuktasāmyogabhūyastvālpīyastvābhyām utpatter na tato 'dhikaparavāparatve pramāṇam iti śaṅkate* (GKṬ 86.1–3). Both terms, *bhūyastva* and *alpīyastva*, also recur immediately below, in the commentary on this same sūtra. Elsewhere, it may be noted, we find the order of words in the compound reversed: thus in Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary on the introductory section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* we read at one place *paravāparatvavirāhe saṃyuktasāmyogālpīyastvabhūyastve durghaṭe, sāmāgrīsatvāt paravāparatvayor avāśyam udāyāpateḥ* (DKṬ 667.12–13; the same order can be found e.g. at NBhū 162.9). Praśastapāda, be it remarked, does not use the same formula but has the related °*bahvalpabhāva* (164.7).

58 Bhaṭṭa Vādindra gives us here what is certainly one of the wilder flights of his exegetical fancy. The sūtra is in any case rather problematic, but our other sources seem to be agreed in interpreting *kāraṇaparatva* and *kāraṇāparatva* as referring to conjunction (!) with far and distant space and/ or time. This tradition may go back at least to Praśastapāda, who refers to this sūtra in support of the assertion that *saṃyoga* is one of the qualities of time: *kāraṇaparatvād iti vacanāt saṃyogaḥ* (63.24–64.1). Candrānanda's commentary, which applies the sūtra to farness and nearness in both space and time, also seems to take both words as referring to *saṃyoga*, though he gives no justification for this, writing only *parāparadikpradeśasaṃyogāḥ asamavāyikāraṇam | tathaiva parāparakūlapradeśasaṃyogau | dikkūlapradeśaiḥ saṃyogāt sannikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭabuddhyapekṣayā sannikṛṣṭe 'paratvam, viprakṛṣṭe ca paratvam* (61.2–4). Essentially the same explanation is found in the *Vyomavati* (Vyo² vol. 1 129.10–11), the *Nyāyakandalī* (170.11) and the *Kiraṇāvalī* (79.21–22). Śaṅkara Miśra only refers the sūtra to farness and nearness in time, perhaps because of the context in which it is used in the PDhS. Certainly this widespread tradition with regard to the meaning of the sūtra is not completely sat-

conjunctions with the conjoined⁵⁹ or movements of the sun.⁶⁰ 'Nearness' of this [means its] having as object a small number of these. It is not correct to say that farness and nearness do not exist, because [we do have] the direct awareness (*anubhava*) that 'this is far' 'this is near.' Farness is being distant and nearness is being close. With respect to time too we have the cognition that an old man is 'far' and a young one 'near.'⁶¹

Farness and nearness are qualities because, while being different from substance or motion, they possess universals, like colour.⁶² The disputed farness and nearness arise from Devadatta's cognition, because, while even when there is connection with [his] sense-organs they are not perceptible to Yajñadatta, they are perceptible to Devadatta, like the number two. Farness and nearness arise from conjunction of [a substance] with form and [a substance] without form,⁶³ because, while having a single substance [as *samavāyikāraṇa*] and being perceptible to [ordinary people] like us and while there is no cause of non-apprehension, such as an obstacle, those [farness and nearness] which are not perceptible to one person are perceptible to another, like pleasure and so on.

The absence of farness and nearness in farness and nearness is

isfactory, but Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's deviation from it inspires even less confidence.

* I prefer this reading found in, among others, J₁ and the group of Bengali manuscripts of the PDhS and supported by the *Kiraṇāvalī* (79.20), to the *kāraṇaparavādivacanāṭ* of the Dvivedin edition. The latter, which also has support from a fair group of manuscripts, including Ś₁, probably arose through eyeskip from one *akṣara* with medial *i* to another, combined with the scribes' unfamiliarity with the VS.

- 59 In other words, when there is a large distance between the observer and the object he is looking at, he has a (presumably very approximate) enumerative cognition of the number of points in space between himself and the object. The closest of these points is conjoined with the point of space he himself is conjoined with, the next conjoined with that and so on. Cf. e.g. Frauwallner 1956, 228.
- 60 This applies of course to the case of distance in time. Thakur rightly reads "*tapanapariṣpanda*" for the "*īvanapariṣpanda*" of the manuscript; *pa* and *va* are notoriously close in Malayalam script. Incidentally, the editors of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the *gūṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* apparently misunderstood the parallel passage in their text: the same compound appears there twice but both times garbled as *nayanapariṣpanda*, an error reflecting the transmission of this text in Devanāgarī manuscripts (GKṭ 87.16 and 87.17). Further occurrences in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's writings are to be found at DKṭ 683.23, 683.27 and 685.4–5.
- 61 Frauwallner (1956, 112) drew attention to the curious fact that when the Vaiśeṣika texts speak of farness and nearness in time, this is the only case considered: there is no mention of the question of events which took place in the very distant as compared to the very recent past (cf. also Halbfass 1992, 217). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is as we see no exception to this.
- 62 In this paragraph Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra offers a series of syllogisms to prove various properties of the qualities farness and nearness. Several of the issues involved are discussed in far greater detail in the *Tarkasāgara* ad 2.2.12 (numbered 2.2.10 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version, where almost the entire passage is omitted), 236.13–237.14.
- 63 I.e. space or time.

explained by [i.e. in analogy with] atomic and large size. 7.2.28

Motions by motions. 7.2.29

Qualities by qualities. 7.2.30

The meaning of these sūtras has already been understood.

That⁶⁴ from which [arises the cognition] 'this is here' with regard to effect and cause is inherence. 7.2.31

The reference to effect and cause is a partial designation; [one should understand the sūtra as meaning that] that from which [the cognition] 'this is here' arises with regard to effect and cause, quality and quality-possessor, motion and that which possesses it, universal and individual manifestation, [ultimate] particularity and that which possesses it⁶⁵ —that is inherence. [For example] 'the cloth is here in the threads' and so on [are cognitions which arise due to inherence].

The refutation of [inherence] being substance, quality or motion is explained by (i.e. in analogy with) reality. 7.2.32

Just as reality, [i.e.] being (*bhāva* = *sattā*), is not a substance nor a quality nor a motion, for the reasons which have previously been taught,⁶⁶ so inherence too [is neither a substance nor a quality nor a motion]. And it is also not one of [the remaining categories, namely] universal, [ultimate] particularity or non-existence, because it is a connection (*sambandha*), like conjunction. Therefore inherence is another [distinct] category.

[Its] 'it-ness' (i.e. unity)⁶⁷ [is explained] by (i.e. in analogy with) being. 7.2.33

- 64 Like Thakur I find it probable that the correlative *sa* has been lost in transmission, due to haplography. Among other recensions, only the two *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts also omit the *sa*, but these may well be independent occurrences of the same error.
- 65 Thakur's conjectural addition of a *ca* at the end of this is quite unnecessary: compare also the wording (without a final *ca*) of a similar list in the *avatarāṇa* to 7.2.10 above.
- 66 Namely in VS 1.2.9–11 (numbering as in Candrānanda). To recapitulate these reasons briefly: being is not a substance because it has (i.e. can have) a single substance as its locus (1.2.9), it is not a quality or a motion because it occurs in qualities and motions (1.2.10) and finally the fact that no lower universal such as substance-ness occurs in it also demonstrates that it can be none of the first three categories (1.2.11). The last of these sūtras is missing in V, presumably lost in abridging or transmission. It is found in the full version (TS 188.4).
- 67 The somewhat curious usage of *tatva* in the VS to mean, apparently, unity, has hardly been studied yet.* The sūtra *tatvaṃ bhāvena* also occurs elsewhere in the VS, as (Candrānanda's) 2.1.28, 2.28 and 2.2.14 (it is noteworthy that in the sūtra corresponding with the one we are now dealing with, 7.2.31, Candrānanda has the anomalous reading *tatvaṃ ca*). At the first occurrence (numbered 2.1.32 in Thakur's edition) the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra's commentary

'It-ness' [means] 'its' condition of being.⁶⁸ [What is meant is that] the very same inherence [which is the relation] of thread and cloth is also the inherence [which is the relation] of universal and individual manifestation. The formal syllogism [on this point runs as follows]: the inherence of universal and individual manifestation and so on is not different from the inherence of thread and cloth, because it is inherence, like the inherence of thread and cloth.⁶⁹ And [another reason that inherence is one is] because there is no inferential mark which establishes⁷⁰ that the inherence [in the two cases] is different. If [one objects that there is such an inferential mark, formulating a syllogism as follows:] the inherence of thread and cloth is different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation and so on, because it is a connection between thread and cloth, like a conjunction between thread and cloth [to this we reply]: No, because [the alleged logical ground] has an *upādhi*⁷¹ due

has *asya bhāvas tattvam* (as here). *tao bhedābhāvaḥ* (25.1). Rather oddly, in Thakur's edition of the long commentary, we find 2.1.31 and 2.1.32 together followed merely by *iti sūtradhvayaṁ gatārtham* (TS 231.5): what makes this particularly suspicious is that it is followed by a footnote in which Thakur informs us after this there is a very large lacuna in his transcript(s).

Cf. e.g. Faddegon's remarks '[t]hat *tattva* here [i.e. in Śaṅkara Miśra's 7.2.28] means *ekatva* is confirmed by comparing the passage V.S. II, 1. 29–30 with the redaction of V.S. I. 2. 17 and by the information received from the Praśastapāda-bhāṣya' (1918, 122). On an apparently very similar use of *tattva* by Bhartṛhari see Houben 1992, 246–247.

68 The translation is awkward; the analysis is of course based on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.1.119 *asya bhāvas tvatalau*.

69 In his *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary Bhaṭṭa Vādindra gives a different but related syllogism to prove the unity of inherence: *samavāyikaṭve 'numānam—vipratipannaḥ samavāyas tantupaṭasamavāyād bhinnatvānadhikaraṇam.* *samavāyalakṣaṇavattvāt, tantupaṭasamavāyavad iti* (DKT 638.18–20).

* *bhinnatvānadhikaraṇam*: em., *bhinnatvānadhikaraṇa°* DKT.

70 My restoration of the small lacuna in the manuscript here differs slightly from Thakur's, chiefly because there is space for several more *akṣaras* than he supplies. The sense of the passage is however hardly affected by this difference. The use of the expression °*sādhakalinga* is attested within Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's works at least once: in the *Tarkasāgara* ad VS 1.2.28 (there is no parallel in the abridged version), one of the interpretations given involves taking the *sallingāviśeṣāt* of the sūtra to imply *ghaṭasattāsādhakalingasya sarvairāviśeṣāt sarvatra ghaṭasattāsiddheḥ* (TS 189.30–31).

71 Like Matilal (1968, 84), I leave *upādhi* untranslated when it occurs in this particular sense, which may be expressed as that of 'a property that pervades the probandum but not the probans' (ibid. loc. cit. n.7). The history of this concept has yet to be written: for a valuable study, though based on material later than our text, see especially Frauwallner's monograph of 1970 on the *upādhi* section of Gaṅgeśa's *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Among more recent literature the remarks in Gerow 1990 (x n.14, 21 n.100 and n.103, 47 n.241 and 57 n.304), though not historically oriented, may be of some interest. Recent attempts to give an English equivalent have varied from 'obstruction' (Potter and Bhattacharyya 1993, passim) to 'precondition' (Gerow 1990, 20) and 'condition' (Gerow 1990, 47), while Frauwallner's choice in German fell on 'zusätzliche Bestimmung' (1970, passim). None of these is very successful in conveying the intention, if we consider how the logicians themselves understand the term, with definitions such as *sādhyaṁ*.

to the absence of the defining mark of inherence.⁷²

Thus the seventh *adhyāya*.

pakarve sati sādhanāvyāpaka upādhiḥ (attributed to Udayana in i.a. the *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī* as quoted in the *Nyāyakośa* s.v., p. 179).

- 72 To interpret Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra, as I think we should, in the light of Udayana's conception of *upādhi* (cf. the previous footnote) rather than with the aid of the subtleties later considered by Gaṅgeśa and his followers: the inference offered by the opponent cannot be accepted because there is a property, namely 'the absence of the defining mark of inherence' or, to paraphrase, 'the fact of not being inherence,' which pervades the property to be proved, in this case 'the being different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation,' but does not pervade the logical ground, in this case 'the being a connection between thread and cloth.' For in Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra's view everything that is different from the inherence of universal and individual manifestation lacks the defining mark of inherence (i.e. is not inherence), but only some of the possible connections (i.e. relations) between thread and cloth lack this defining mark (i.e. are not inherence but instances of conjunction). And the existence of such a property entails that the property to be proved does not pervade the logical ground, in other words that the logical ground is not invariably concomitant with the property to be proved (cf. e.g. Potter and Bhattacharyya 1993, 72–73).

PART II

CANDRĀNANDA'S COMMENTARY ON THE VS

In this part a new edition is presented of a portion of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS. This commentary is the oldest one we have on the sūtras, and the recension of the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains is thus also quite probably the earliest one now available.¹ A re-edition of the complete commentary is currently nearing completion. Partly because a broader manuscript basis was used than by the *editor princeps*, the Jaina monk and scholar Muni Jambūvijaya, it has been possible to improve on his work in some places. His edition remains nonetheless a most impressive achievement, an example of scholarship of a rare order.

2.1 Candrānanda

About the author of this commentary on the VS there is little that is known and not very much ground for conjecture. Nor do I have anything very significant to add to what has been already observed.

Briefly, then, we have no certain indications as to the time in which Candrānanda lived. As *terminus post quem* we may take A.D. 600 or thereabouts, on the strength of Candrānanda's explicit reference to Uddyotakara and his quotation of the latter's *Nyāyavārttika* (cf. Candrānanda ad VS 3.2.4, 29.4). The *terminus ante quem* cannot be established with as much certainty, but Aklujkar has pointed out close similarities between portions of Helārāja's commentary on Bhartṛhari's *Vākyapadīya* and passages of Candrānanda's commentary. He considers that these are 'obviously quoted from his [i.e. Candrānanda's] *vr̥tti*' (1970, 340); this seems a little over-certain, but I agree that this is at least a plausible assumption.² Helārāja

¹ It cannot be excluded though that one of the two recensions which are currently known from manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* alone (see Part III below) goes back to a redaction of the sūtras which pre-dates Candrānanda.

² The chief other possibility that is to be reckoned with is that both authors have drawn on some earlier exegetical work current in Kashmir.

being assigned with considerable certainty to the tenth century (cf. e.g. Aklujkar 1970, 340), this period would then be the latest in which Candrānanda might have flourished.

Another possible citation of our commentator has been pointed out by Shah. In Abhinavagupta's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivimarśinī*, a work which was completed in November A.D. 1014 (cf. Shah 1975, 7), a verse is quoted which is attributed to Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda. The subject is unrelated with Vaiśeṣika topics, and the verse hints rather at a monistic background; perhaps for this reason the reference is not always adduced as evidence for the Vaiśeṣika author's date.³ However there is no reason why the same author should not have written works dealing with quite different systems; there are many examples of this that we know of, and even some reason to think that Abhinavagupta himself may have written a commentary on the PDhS.⁴ The name Candrānanda is not a common one; the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (vol. 6, 1971, 374) has entries for our author and for the Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda quoted by Abhinavagupta, and lists no others with the same name.⁵ Abhinavagupta's time and place of activity being also very close to those of Helārāja, I am inclined provisionally to accept this too as a genuine reference to our commentator.

As far as the—weaker—internal evidence of thought and style is concerned, I find myself in agreement with Chemparathy, who writes 'judging from the contents and the style of his work I feel strongly inclined to place this commentary before the tenth century, probably in the seventh or eighth century, this latter precision being hypothetical' (1970, 48).

A dissenting view has been mentioned by Potter, who ranks Candrānanda among a group of 'a few undatable writers,' reporting that 'estimates of his date differ widely. Sandesara suggests the 7th century,⁶ but Hattori thinks it is much later, possibly after our period altogether' (1977, 685). 'Our period' here presumably means the period up to approximately A.D. 1350 (cf. Potter 1977, xi). No reference is given to a publication of Hattori, however, nor do I know of any in which such a view is expressed. As far as I can see, not the slightest trace of evidence can be found in the commentary itself for so late a date.

As to the geographical region in which Candrānanda lived and wrote, the indications, admittedly not conclusive, that we have point clearly to Kashmir. Thus the two authors who, as we have seen, may have known his writings both hail from that area, and the manuscripts of his commentary are either written in Śāradā or can be

³ Thus Nozawa (1993a, 97a–b), for instance, cites Aklujkar 1970 but not Shah 1975.

⁴ Cf. footnote 44 on p. 333 below.

⁵ Under the entry for the author of the VS commentary, NCC (loc. cit.) also lists another, unpublished, work, the title of which is given as *Niśreyasādhigamaprakaraṇa*. The reference is to the *Jainagranthāvalī*, which I have not been able to check.

⁶ Potter refers to Sandesara's forward to Jambūvijaya's edition, p. viii.

shown to have descended from manuscripts in that script (cf. p. 145ff. below).

Little appears to have been written on Candrānanda as an individual thinker. This is not too surprising though, for, unlike Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra in his long commentary, Candrānanda confines himself by and large quite strictly to explanation of the sūtras, without digressing and also usually without discussion of various possible interpretations or theories. The impression one receives most strongly on reading his commentary is that he is deeply influenced by Praśastapāda, and on most points faithful to the latter's thought. Close verbal parallels with the PDhS, including literal, unattributed, quotations are frequent.⁷

The only study so far devoted exclusively to an aspect of Candrānanda's philosophy is Chemparathy's brief article on the commentator's theology (1970). Chemparathy leaves open the question whether there is anything original in what Candrānanda says in the few passages where God and His qualities are mentioned, writing 'although his proof for the existence of Īśvara based on the names given to objects may be deduced from an earlier proof of Praśastamati [i.e. Praśastapāda],—and Candrānanda himself seems to ascribe it to others before him.⁸ yet so far I have not come across another author who has formulated a direct argument for the existence of Īśvara from the naming of objects' (1970, 51).

Nevertheless, there is at least one significant point which should be mentioned, in which Candrānanda deviates not only from Praśastapāda but indeed from all other Vaiśeṣika writers I know of, and which he does not attribute to others. In his commentary on VS 4.1.8, part of a section of the VS that deals with perception (4.1.6–14), he mentions in passing that triads (*tryaṇukas*) are not perceived. This is contrary to the view, which is otherwise unanimous as far as I know, that since triads are the smallest substances which are technically speaking 'large' (*mahat*), they can be perceived by ordinary people. This view of Candrānanda's is repeated even more explicitly in his commentary on 7.1.15, where he remarks that though triads are large they are not perceived.⁹

7 Cf. Werba's characterization (Frauwallner 1992, 137 n. 9) 'die 1961 von JAMBUVIJAYAN veröffentlichte Vṛtti Candrānandas (VV) mit ihren zahlreichen, bisher unbeachtet gebliebenen Parallelen zu Praśastapādas Text,' and also Isaacson 1990, 14–15, 22 n. 36 and 25 n. 41 n. 43 and n. 44.

8 The passage which Chemparathy has in mind, and refers to in his footnote at this point (n. 24), is the commentary on VS 6.1.3, which runs *vinopadeśena brāhmaṇādīkam artham asmākam ālocayatām pratyakṣeṇa na brāhmaṇo 'yam iti jñānam utpadyate | pratyakṣeṇa cārtham ālocya samjñāpranayanam drṣṭam putrādisu | santi caitā brāhmaṇādisaṃjñāh, tā yena pratyakṣam artham ālocya prañitā iti sūtrārtham varṇayanti* (45.14–16). I think that from the concluding words one may be more confident that the idea expressed here is not one formulated for the first time by Candrānanda than is implied by Chemparathy's 'seems to ascribe it to others before him.'

9 Cf. Isaacson 1990, 16–17 n. 20. Dr. K. Preisendanz has informed me that she independently

Aside from this one unique feature, which may of course also have been taken over by Candrānanda from some lost writer(s), there are perhaps a few small points where Candrānanda differs from Praśastapāda at least in emphasis. Attention shall be drawn to these as they occur, in the textual and exegetical commentary on the edited text.¹⁰

2.2 The *editio princeps*

Though the existence of a commentary by Candrānanda on the VS has been known since 1874 or so,¹¹ the *editio princeps* was not published until 1961. The editor was the Jaina Muni Jambūvijaya,¹² one of the most distinguished Jaina scholars of this century. This edition was not surprisingly received with gratitude and admiration by the most prominent scholars working in the field. Anantalal Thakur, who had himself made a similar contribution a few years earlier with his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary on the VS (cf. Part I of this thesis), contributed a lengthy introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. Even more weight may be accorded to Erich Frauwallner's review of the edition of Candrānanda's commentary, which appeared in the WZKSO in 1962. At this time, Frauwallner could already be regarded as the world's leading expert on early Vaiśeṣika, on the strength of the publication in 1956 of his impressive study in the second volume of his *Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie*. His review accorded the edition unreserved praise. There could of course be no doubt as to the importance of the text itself, of which Frauwallner rightly remarked that it must be used in all future work on the early Vaiśeṣika.¹³ As for the quality of the editorial work, Frauwallner had the following to say.

made the same observation.

10 Cf. e.g. p. 184 below.

11 The year in which manuscript J₂ was collected—and indeed also copied (cf. p. 146 below). The 1873–1874 collection was made by Bühler (cf. the Preface of Bhandarkar 1888); the Report is not available to me directly, but the list in Bhandarkar 1888 is said in the Preface to be a reprint of one published earlier.

12 On the titlepage of the book the honorific -ji is added to the editor's name. I omit the suffix because Jambūvijaya himself does not seem to use it (cf. the conclusion of his Sanskrit introduction) and because it is not found on the titlepages of several of his other editions and publications.

13 Unfortunately, even more than a quarter-century after the publication of Jambūvijaya's edition, articles and books continue to appear which base their statements and conclusions about the early Vaiśeṣika on the text of the VS as commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra, and do not refer to, or even appear to be aware of, Candrānanda's commentary and the *sūtrapāṭha* it contains. A striking example is formed by a book by Veena Gajendragadkar, *Kaṇāda's Doctrine of the Padārthas i.e. the Categories*. Delhi 1988.

Darüber hinaus erhält die vorliegende Ausgabe durch die Leistung des Herausgebers besonderen Wert. Nicht nur daß die Herstellung des Textes aufs sorgfältigste unter Heranziehung alles erreichbaren Materials erfolgte, und daß dem Text alles beigegeben ist, was zu einer wissenschaftlichen Ausgabe gehört, Vergleich der verschiedene Sūtra-Versionen, Sūtra-Index usw. Der Herausgeber hat überdies das Werk durch eine Reihe wertvoller Beigaben bereichert. . . Schließlich ist noch die Fülle wertvoller Angaben zu erwähnen, welche in den Anmerkungen enthalten ist. So stellt das Werk eine ungewöhnliche Quelle für alle weitere Forschung dar, für welche der Herausgeber wärmsten Dank verdient.

Coming from such an authority as Frauwallner, justly renowned for both philological and philosophical acumen, it is understandable that such a judgement should have set the tone for the further reception of this edition. Indeed, I can hardly think of a single scholar who has expressed really critical remarks about this edition, or even hinted that a revised or new edition might ever be desirable.¹⁴ It may therefore come as a surprise—or even be taken as an example of presumption—that someone should think it necessary to attempt such a new edition. Nonetheless, as I have tried to show elsewhere,¹⁵ like any edition and especially any pioneering edition, Jambūvijaya's work, careful though it is on the whole, can be improved on. One reason for this is that there are manuscripts of the commentary which Jambūvijaya did not use, and seems indeed not to have known of. Another is that Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus is rather incomplete and not free of errors, so that even if his proposed reading is acceptable the precise evidence on which it is based is often not accurately presented. Finally, there are some places where although no new, different, reading is available, I feel unable to fully concur with my predecessor's text-critical decisions; this category is not a very large one but contains nonetheless a few instances which are of some importance for interpretation.

14 Least of all, apparently, did Jambūvijaya himself feel any change to be necessary. A reprint of his edition appeared in 1982, and in the Foreword by A.N. Jani we read that 'Muni Śrī Jambūvijaya'ī was requested to revise the work but he replied that the work needs no revision. Hence it is reprinted after correcting the misprints' (cf. also footnote 16 on p. 145 below). Incidentally, despite this last remark, the reprint fails to correct most of the misprints of the first edition, nor does it include the original *śuddhipātrakam*. Instead, a sprinkling of new misprints has been added. Scholars should therefore be warned that though the reprint at first sight seems to be a photo-mechanical one, the text has been reset. If at all possible, the first edition only should be used.

15 In especially section IV of Isaacson 1995.

2.3 The manuscripts of the commentary

As has been mentioned, one of the chief reasons to take up this task is the availability of manuscript material that had not been used in the *editio princeps*. As far as I am aware at present, there are five extant manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary, i.e. three besides the two which Jambūvijaya knew of and used.

2.3.1 Description of the manuscripts

The following list introduces the sigla by which the various manuscripts will be designated in the rest of this part and provides some description. In view chiefly of the number of manuscripts, these descriptions have been kept very brief; I intend to give a fuller account of them elsewhere. All of the manuscripts are written on paper.

- J₁ A manuscript which formerly belonged to Muni Puṇyavijaya and has now passed into the collection of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad.¹⁶ Muni Puṇyavijaya allowed Jambūvijaya the use of this manuscript, and it is designated in Jambūvijaya's edition by the siglum P. As far as I am aware, it has not been catalogued by the L.D. Institute.

For Jambūvijaya's description of the manuscript see p. 2 of his Sanskrit introduction (*prastāvanā*). A slightly less detailed description is given by Thakur in his English introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. The manuscript is written in Jaina Devanāgarī script and consists of 34 folios. Size 23.0 × 8.3 cm.¹⁷ There is no date, nor indeed a final colophon; the remaining space on f. 34v after the final words of the commentary is filled up with *chas*. According to

16 I am indebted to the kindness and efforts of Muni Jambūvijaya, Prof. A. Wezler and the authorities of the L.D. Institute for providing me with a photocopy of the manuscript. It may be of interest to quote here from a copy Prof. Wezler has given me of a letter written to him by Muni Jambūvijaya, dated 9-3-92: 'The fact is that the ms. was returned to Muni Shri Puṇyavijayaḥ who sent it to me. I have completely utilised it in the edition of the *vaiśeṣikasūtra* [this word is written in Devanāgarī script]. I think it is of no use now... It will most probably be in the L. D. Institute, because before his expiration Rev. Muni Shri puṇyavijayaḥ mahārāja [these two words are written in Devanāgarī script] had given all his books, to the Institute.' The view that a manuscript used once for an edition, even by a good and careful scholar, can then be neglected is one which must be deplored (cf. also footnote 14 on p. 144 above): suffice it to point out that in Greek and Latin, not to speak of medieval, text-criticism, there are many cases where we have several editions based on exactly the same manuscripts. To err is human, and it is rare that re-collation does not reveal one or two mistakes in reading.

17 Jambūvijaya gives the dimensions of the manuscript in the words *patrāṇāṃ dairghyaṃ catur-daśāṅgulapramitaḥ āyāmas tu pañcāṅgulapramitaḥ* (*prastāvanā* p. 2).

Jambūvijaya, 'experts on palaeography, paper and so on' are of the opinion that the manuscript was written in the fourteenth century of the Vikrama era (*vaikrame caturdaśe śatake 'yam ādarśo likhita iti lipipatrādisvarūpavidām abhiprāyaḥ* p.2); I must confess to being a little surprised by the proposal of so early a date (corresponding to the 13th–14th century of the Christian era), but being by no means an expert on palaeography or paper, I am not able to argue forcefully against it.

Before the text of the commentary, with the sūtras embedded therein, the manuscript contains the entire *sūtrapāṭha* alone, in a form which agrees very closely with that in which it is found in the commentary. It seems on the whole most plausible that, as Wezler suggests, 'this *sūtrapāṭha* has to be viewed as extracted from Candrānanda's commentary itself rather than forming part of the tradition to which Candrānanda or a copyist had access' (1982, 644), though the latter possibilities should I think still be kept in mind. For this section of the manuscript I use the siglum J_1^s ; Jambūvijaya calls it PS.

J_1 is the only one of the manuscripts which has marginal corrections in what appears to be a hand distinct from that of the original scribe.

- J_2 Manuscript in the BORI, No. 99 of 1873–74. Jaina Devanāgarī script. 20 folios. Size 18.5×31.5 cm. Dated *saṃvat* 1931, corresponding to A.D. 1874/1875. In view of the date in which the manuscript was collected, it must have been copied in A.D. 1874; small wonder that Bhandarkar's catalogue (1888, 59) calls it a 'N.C.' i.e. new copy. The catalogue gives 'Jesalmīr' as the place where the manuscript was bought.

Like J_1 this manuscript begins with the *sūtrapāṭha* alone; for this section I use the siglum J_2^s .

- \dot{S}_1 Manuscript in the Oriental Institute, Baroda, no. 1831h. This is the manuscript to which Jambūvijaya assigns the siglum O. Jambūvijaya's description may again be found on p. 2 of his *prastāvanā*, and Thakur's, in English, on p. 1 of his Introduction to Jambūvijaya's edition. It forms part of a codex with several texts described in Jambūvijaya's words as *tarkabhāṣādivādaśapustakāni* (loc. cit.); only the folios with Candrānanda's commentary are available to me. The commentary begins on f. 6r and ends on f. 41v. The final folio is unnumbered. The manuscript is undated; Thakur calls it 'not very old' (loc. cit.), and is probably right in this, though as usual I find it difficult to be certain about dating Śārādā manuscripts.

Ś₂ Manuscript in the BORI, No. 403 of 1875–76. Śāradā script. 33 folios. Size 26.5 × 17 cm. Undated; very similar in appearance to Ś₁. This is the only one of the Śāradā manuscripts which is not a ‘Sammelhandschrift.’

Ś₃ Manuscript in the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, No. 4635.¹⁸ Śāradā script. The manuscript contains first the text of the *Tarkasaṃgraha* followed by that of the commentary *Tarkadīpikā* thereon. After that our text follows, beginning on f. 22r15 and ending on f. 35r. The verso of f. 35 (which is not numbered) contains the beginning of another text, which I have not identified. There are no further folios preserved. In contrast to the usual practice in manuscripts written in Śāradā script the writing runs parallel to the longest sides, as in the customary format for manuscripts in other scripts. Only f. 35v has standard Śāradā layout, with the writing parallel to the shorter sides. The hand is quite different from that of Ś₁ and Ś₂, being smaller, with less contrast between the thicks and thins of the pen-strokes, and with the lines quite close together. The page therefore makes a dense and uninviting appearance. Sūtras and colophons have been marked with what looks like red pencil or crayon. The general appearance of both paper and script suggest that the manuscript is considerably younger than Ś₁ and Ś₂.

At the end of our text there is a scribal colophon reading *saṃ 64 bhā* (i.e. *bhādrapade*) *śu* (i.e. *śuklapakṣe*) *di* (i.e. *divase*) *ṣaṣṭhyāṃ bhaume pūritam etan madhusūdanena svopayogārtham* (f. 35r23). The date is obviously one in the *saptarṣi* or *laukika* era, with the century omitted, as is unfortunately common practice (cf. Slaje 1993, 24). Prof. M. Yano has kindly informed me that the date can in this case be verified with a high degree of probability as corresponding to Tuesday September 11th, 1888.¹⁹

The Śāradā manuscripts collectively, or a reading shared by all of them, will be designated with the siglum Ś.

A concordance of all the manuscripts with Jambūvijaya’s edition will be found as Appendix 2.

18 I am indebted to Mr. D. Goodall for informing me of the existence of this manuscript, and to Dr. Śītāṃśu Rath and other authorities of the Scindia Oriental Institute for allowing me to photograph it.

19 Prof. Yano responded to the electronic bulletin-board ‘Indology’ on Tuesday March 14th, 1995 (Message-Id {0098D5B0.FE8F60EC.14@ksuvx0.kyoto-su.ac.jp}). answering my question regarding the verification of this date posted in the same forum on Monday March 13th, 1995.

2.3.2 The relationship between the manuscripts

Fortunately the manuscript tradition of Candrānanda's commentary as we have it seems to present a fairly straightforward picture. Manuscript affiliations are easily determined and clear-cut; a fact that is indicative of a rather slender transmission, i.e. one with a relatively small number of manuscripts, and freedom from contamination. It should be noted in this connection that the manuscripts can be associated with a rather limited geographical area beyond which we have no evidence that Candrānanda's commentary ever spread.

Collation shows that the five manuscripts fall into two well-defined groups; on the one hand the two in Jaina Devanāgarī and on the other the three Śāradā manuscripts. In the case of the first of these groups, the evidence that J_2 (which, as will be remembered, is a very recent manuscript) is a direct descendant of J_1 , very probably an immediate one, i.e. an apograph, is overwhelming. As has been noticed, these manuscripts agree strikingly already in the matter of the formal organization of their contents, with both giving at the outset the text of the sūtras alone and following this with Candrānanda's commentary, with the sūtras embedded in it. The extent to which they agree in error both in matters of substantives and accidentals is also most striking, and I think all of J_2 's divergencies from J_1 can be explained as typical scribal errors. It is particularly important to note that there are cases where J_2 's reading is that of J_1 *post correctionem*, with the correction in J_1 being one which can be convincingly argued to be a wrong one not based on the/an exemplar; for an instance of this see p. 181 below. This indicates that the close agreement of the two sources is not caused by their sharing a common ancestor, but that J_2 must indeed have descended from J_1 . In my opinion, the relationship between these two manuscripts may be regarded as established with as much certainty as is ever possible on the strength of internal evidence alone. We may therefore eliminate J_2 as an independent witness; its use seems confined to the confirmation of readings in J_1 which may be difficult to make out.

The Śāradā manuscripts are also very closely related, with a large number of mistakes held in common. To be brief, it is certain that they share a common ancestor which was itself corrupt at quite a few places and lacunose at others. None of them is however an apograph or descendant of another.

I shall present a small selection only of the evidence which leads me to these conclusions. First of all the Śāradā manuscripts all must descend from an ancestor that was damaged or lacunose. This is most clearly indicated at the very end of the commentary, ad 10.20–21, where they all at three places indicate by dashes the defective nature of their original.²⁰ Interesting is that at one of these places \dot{S}_2 reads

20 This can be clearly seen in the reproduction of the final folio of \dot{S}_1 which is given as Plate II in

two more syllables than \acute{S}_1 and \acute{S}_3 ; this is one of a number of indications that the latter two cannot have been copied from \acute{S}_2 , nor, most probably, \acute{S}_2 from one of the others. Instead \acute{S}_2 is regularly a little better than \acute{S}_1 or \acute{S}_3 ; whether this is because it was copied directly from the hyparchetype manuscript when that was in slightly better condition or because the scribe has here and there himself improved the text of his original it is not possible to say.

In addition, there is a large number of significant errors shared by all three manuscripts which can hardly be explained as purely coincidental. I restrict myself to a few examples, drawn from portions of the work of which a re-edition is not included below. Many other, equally striking, cases can be found easily enough from the critical apparatus.

1. In the commentary on 3.2.3 we read *ataḥ prayatnajñānāyugapadyād ekaṃ manaḥ pratiśarīraṃ mūrtam asparśaṃ niravayavaṃ nityam aṇv āsūcārīti* (28.11–12). No variants are given by Jambūvijaya, but all the Śāradā manuscripts read *āsūkārīti* for *āsūcārīti*. The latter reading of J_1 is confirmed by Praśastapāda's *āsusaṃcāri ceti* (PDhS 89.20) and by the sense; the *manas* may be said to move (rapidly) but hardly to do/act, which is rather the prerogative of the soul.
2. In the sentence that forms part of the commentary on 6.1.4, *yata eva parameśvarasya kṛtīr vedādau vākyapadaracanāto 'yaṃ smārto 'pi dānavidhis tadīyam āmnāyam anantaśākhābhinnam ālocya saṃkṣepam anumanyamānānām bhr̥guprabhṛtīnām buddhipūrvah* (45.19–20), the Śāradā manuscripts unanimously read *ya eva śrīparameśvarasya* for *yata eva parameśvarasya*.²¹ As is quite clear, *ya eva* is an error and *yata eva* must be right; it is highly implausible that all three manuscripts made the mistake independently, especially since there is no obvious factor to have provoked a mechanical error, so this must be evidence of a genetic relationship. The *śrīparameśvarasya* is also very likely to be a secondary reading, as the *śrī* is far more likely to have been added scribally than to have been deleted (cf. also the similar case discussed briefly in the textual commentary on Candrānanda's commentary on 1.1.1, p. 183 below), so this also may count as an indication of common ancestry.
3. The \acute{S} manuscripts all omit a fairly large section of the commentary, from °*vidyā* in 9.25 upto and including *pañcabhyo* in 10.1 (cf. Jambūvijaya's note 6 in the apparatus on p. 70). The colophon of the ninth *adhyāya* is also missing in

Jambūvijaya's edition.

²¹ Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus here is, as all too often, sadly inaccurate: he wrongly reports \acute{S}_1 as reading *evam* instead of *eva*, and does not give the manuscript's really variant readings.

consequence. There is no apparent cause for eyeskip, and it is incredible that the error should have occurred independently in more than one manuscript.

Aside from numerous such agreements in error, convincing evidence of their close relationship, each also has a number of mistakes and omissions which are unique to it, so that it seems impossible that any one should be an apograph of either of the others. The precise relation between them is difficult to establish; I am at present inclined to believe that \dot{S}_1 and \dot{S}_3 have a common ancestor and that this lost manuscript and \dot{S}_2 are both apographs of the hyparchetype of this recension, σ , as we may call it. To prove this, and to rule out the possibility that instead all three are independent apographs of σ , is a difficult task, and I shall postpone the attempt to a later occasion.²² For the present, and for virtually all practical purposes of the edition, it is only important that, unlike J_2 , \dot{S}_2 and \dot{S}_3 are to be regarded as genuinely new witnesses to the text. Using the Śāradā manuscripts it should be possible, in principle, to reconstruct the readings of their common ancestor, σ , in the majority of cases. This provides a better basis than Jambūvijaya had, for in some places \dot{S}_1 has an isolated reading which is unlikely to be that of the hyparchetype.

Next a word as to J_1 's ancestry. There are a number of traces which clearly point to J_1 's being descended from a manuscript in Śāradā script, and, again, the probability is that this manuscript was J_1 's immediate ancestor. We find a number of mistakes which can be associated with typical confusion between Śāradā characters.²³ As an example one might mention the scribe's first writing *svana°* for *svarga°* in the commentary on 6.1.1; *rga*, though quite different from Śāradā *na*, is very like a Jaina Devanāgarī *na* such as the scribe would have been most familiar with. Another similar confusion lies behind *bhedādīnām* for *bheryādīnām* in the *avatarāṇa* to 2.1.14; Śāradā *ry* is again very like a (Jaina) Devanāgarī *d*.²⁴ Significantly, we also find evidence that an ancestor of J_1 made occasional use of *jihvāmūliya*, another feature of Śāradā script which is very rare in Devanāgarī manuscripts; this too has resulted into a number of mistakes. For instance, in 1.1.28 the section of the manuscript which gives the *sūtrapāṭha* separately reads *saṃyogavibhāgāt karmaṇām* for *saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmaṇām*.²⁵

22 The reason for the difficulty is the number of manuscripts in the group: as is well known, it is theoretically impossible to definitively determine the relation between three manuscripts with textual analysis alone—the so-called 'ambiguity of three texts' (cf. Greg 1927, 21). Of course codicological and other, not strictly textual, evidence may allow the ambiguity to be resolved, and it is partly with arguments of this type that I hope to be able to settle the problem of our three Śāradā manuscripts.

23 For a list of 'semi-homographe Akṣaras' in Śāradā, with large, clear reproductions, see Slaje 1993, 43–45. A few more could perhaps have been added to the list; thus I see no mention of *śś/śc*, two common ligatures which are virtually indistinguishable in most Śāradā hands.

24 Cf. for another example p. 181 below.

25 Another case which should be noted is the sūtra 8.10: Jambūvijaya's edition reads this *dravyaḥ*.

Let us now briefly consider the relationship between on the one hand \dot{S} (or σ) and on the other J_1 (or its \dot{S} radā ancestor). The presence of a number of readings which cannot but be corruptions in all the manuscripts shows fairly clearly that σ and J_1 may both be descended from a manuscript in which these corruptions were already present, and which must therefore itself be distinct from the presumed 'original' or autograph manuscript.²⁶ But on the other hand the differences between the two are so numerous and substantial that they are probably at a considerable remove from their common ancestor. As far as I can see, there are no signs of contamination/conflation in any of the manuscripts, and I assume that there has been none. Of course it cannot be ruled out that conflation did take place in the transmission before the archetype; but I find it impossible to say anything precise or useful about this possibility.

2.4 Editorial policy

From its palaeography and appearance it may be safely said that J_1 is the oldest of our manuscripts. But it should be remembered that it has gone through the process of transcription from \dot{S} radā to Jaina Devanāgarī script, leaving in some cases clear traces but perhaps in others corruption which is less easily recognized. Of the \dot{S} radā manuscripts it is plausible to assume that, though there has been more than enough opportunity for scribal error to be introduced, at least the additional factor of transcription from one script to another, fairly different one, did not play a role.

What is more, we have seen that J_1 and on the other hand the \dot{S} radā manuscripts seem to represent two independent lines of descent from a common archetype. Of course it should not be assumed that the relative clarity of the manuscript relationships entails that an editor's decisions can always be clear-cut. The bifurcation of

anitaretarakāraṇāt kāraṇāyauṅgapadyāt. No variants on this are given in the critical apparatus, but in the *vrddhipratrakam* Jambūvijaya reports that the \dot{S} radā manuscript and the section of the Jaina Devanāgarī manuscript which gives the sūtras within the commentary read thus, while the first part of the Jaina manuscript, giving the *sūtrapāṭha* alone, reads *dravyeṣv itaretarakāraṇāt kāraṇāyauṅgapadyāt*. He then adds '*dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ kāraṇāyauṅgapadyāt*' *iii pāṭho 'ira saṁtctno bhāti* (p. 231). He certainly is right about this, but two points need to be remarked on. First of all, the \dot{S} radā manuscript is in fact not available here as a witness. As was correctly noted in the last entry in the apparatus on p. 62, a large section, including the text of 8.6–13, has been left out in the \dot{S} radā manuscript (and this applies also to the other \dot{S} radā manuscript, not known to Jambūvijaya, which is introduced below). So it is the Jaina Devanāgarī manuscript alone which is present here. Secondly, the reading *°kāraṇāt* which we find in both sections of the manuscript, can with virtual certainty be explained as a misreading of *°kāraṇāḥ* written with (\dot{S} radā) *jihvāmūlīya* before the following *kāraṇāyauṅgapadyāt*.

26 For discussion of a few such places see p. 190, p. 190 and p. 191 below.

the 'stemma' means instead that when the two branches differ in reading there is no way to decide between the two except by weighing the merits of their respective readings carefully—there is no mechanical way to choose between them. In doing so, we find that both J_1 and the Śāradā manuscripts, frequently seem to preserve the correct reading when the other branch is corrupt. The Ś recension has perhaps on the whole a slightly larger number of serious errors, such as omissions, but it is only with witnesses from both traditions that the text can be constituted more or less satisfactorily.²⁷ Of course if J_1 and one or two of the Śāradā manuscripts share a reading, the agreement strongly suggests that the variant is archetypal and that the reading(s) of the other Śāradā manuscript(s) are not. This does not mean, however, that the shared reading is original; as was mentioned above (p. 151) the common ancestor seems to have had already a number of errors, and like Jambūvijaya I attempt to correct these, when considerations such as sense, context or parallels allow doing so with some degree of certainty.

Exactly what Jambūvijaya's editorial policy was he does not tell us, and it is difficult to determine. My impression is that he has taken J_1 as his 'copy-text,' and emended it, where he found it necessary to do so, with the single Śāradā manuscript at his disposal; compare his remark on the relative merits of his two manuscripts quoted in footnote 27. As a consequence, there are occasional readings in his text which are found in J_1 and which are quite possible as to sense, but which in my view are likely to be secondary as compared to an equally possible reading of the Ś tradition. In other words, I feel that he has favoured J_1 a little, whereas it has been my endeavour to base my decision on the readings, not on the identity of the manuscript(s) containing them, at all places where the two branches differ. Nonetheless, even though I have tried to weigh the evidence as carefully as possible before—necessarily—taking a decision, there are quite a number of places where only very weak, and sometimes conflicting, arguments can be mustered for choosing one reading over another. For this reason I have endeavoured above all to present the evidence as fully as possible so that others may arrive at their own conclusions. It follows that the differences between the critical apparatus of the new edition and that of the *editio princeps*, which is incomplete and inaccurate to a rather high degree,²⁸

27 Compare Jambūvijaya's evaluation of J_1 and Ś₁: O-P *ity anayoḥ P śuddhataras tathāpi kaṭipayasthāneṣu Opātha eva samīcīnaḥ (prastāvanā p. 2).*

28 A comparison of the apparatus of my edition with that of Jambūvijaya will show this clearly, but even simply from Jambūvijaya's edition alone it is easy to determine this fact. For, very commendably, no less than six plates are given with reproductions of the manuscripts: two of these are of the first and last sides of O (i.e. Ś₁) and the other four are of P(S) (i.e. J_1/J_1^c). Any reader is therefore in a position to check the editor's reading and reporting of his manuscripts for a fair sample of the text, and anyone who takes the trouble to do this will find that numerous variants, sometimes significant ones, are not mentioned in Jambūvijaya's critical apparatus. In the textual commentary I have pointed out a number of individual cases in which Jambūvijaya

may be as important as the adoption of different readings in the text itself. It lies within the very nature of editing, i.e. reconstructing, that conclusive results are frequently impossible. To point out cases where a different choice could be equally well defended is one of the functions of the commentary on the text which I have provided (cf. p. 156f. below).

2.5 Conventions of the text and apparatus

The text has been presented in Devanāgarī script, which brings with it the advantage of being more easily readable for many scholars than a Roman transliteration and is also aesthetically more pleasing. The slight reduction in precision which the use of Devanāgarī entails, especially in the reporting of manuscript readings in the apparatus, has been felt to be outweighed by these considerations, as the number of manuscripts is great enough that it is of little importance for the constitution of the text to note all cases where a part of an *akṣara* is unclear.²⁹

The sigla used for the various manuscripts have already been introduced on p. 145–147 above. Readings attributed to ‘Jambū.’ are those of the *editio princeps*. As there is a fair number of witnesses to the text, I have introduced a short-hand for readings shared by all but one: the siglum Σ . The single deviant source is of course always indicated.

Variants on the text of the sūtras are in the topmost layer of apparatus. It will be remembered that for the sūtras we have the additional evidence of J_1^S , so that there are in effect five manuscript witnesses. Entries are keyed to the text by sūtra-number alone. The bottom layer of apparatus records the variants on the text of the commentary. Where necessary, a layer between these two is added, which provides identifications of (or records failure to identify) quotations found in the commentary. In these lower two layers of apparatus lemmas are keyed to the text by line-number references. The use of superscript *ac* (e.g. \dot{S}_1^{ac}) to indicate readings before correction and superscript *pc* (e.g. \dot{S}_1^{pc}) to indicate readings which result from scribal correction should be clear and familiar.

Like the critical apparatus of the edition of two *adhyāyas* of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra’s com-

fails to report important variants: cf. for instance footnote 21 on p. 149 above and p. 181 below (the latter case being one which can be checked from Jambūvijaya’s Plates).

29 This latter point constitutes the main reason for the difference of my decision here from the one made with regard to the presentation of the text of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra’s commentary: in the latter case, with a sole witness for the text, it is far more crucial to achieve maximum precision in reporting the reading of the manuscript. Cf. p. 52 above.

mentary in Part I, the apparatus here is a strictly positive one.³⁰ Many of the conventions used in the apparatus are identical with those introduced in that edition : (see p. 53 above). The divergences are for the greater part related to the quite different nature of the transmission, with four manuscripts compared to the *codex unicus* of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary. As lemma sign a] is used, rather than a :, to avoid possible confusion with *visarga*. No brackets have been used in the actual text, and no use is made of double brackets ([]]). The apparatus uses the following symbols:

- () Indicate that the reading of the enclosed *akṣara*(s) in a given manuscript is uncertain.
- { } Enclose *akṣaras* that have been cancelled in a given manuscript.³¹
- + + Enclose *akṣaras* which have been added, in the margin or between the lines, in a given manuscript.³²
- { } These braces have been used at some places to avoid repetition and keep the size of the apparatus down. Their function can best be explained with an example: an entry of the type *guṇā{ṇa Ś₁}nām Ś*, is a convenient shorthand for *guṇānām Ś₂Ś₃, guṇānām Ś₁*.
- ... Indicates a space-saving ellipsis; used only in lemmas, where the elided text can be easily and unambiguously determined from a glance at the constituted text.
- * This symbol stands for the dash at the level of the head-line of the *akṣaras* which is used in the manuscripts (by far most frequently in the Śāradā ones) to indicate a lacuna in or illegibility of their exemplar.

In addition, the following abbreviations are used in the apparatus:

- om. Indicates that the text of the lemma is omitted in the specified manuscripts.

30 From working closely with editions prepared by others as well as from trying my hand at editing texts of different kinds myself, I have become convinced that the advantages of a fully positive apparatus far outweigh the additional expenditure of time and space which it demands. Except perhaps in very unusual cases, it is strongly to be urged that this type of apparatus be made the standard in critical editions.

31 Note the difference in the use of these angled brackets as compared with the edition of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary.

32 I am aware of course that these plus-signs are not directional, but believe that there are no cases in the apparatus where confusion is really likely as to whether one marks the beginning or the end of an insertion.

em. Indicates that the preceding reading is an emendation. When the accepted text is an emendation which Jambūvijaya already made and adopted, the lemma sign is followed by 'em. Jambū.'

conj. Indicates that the preceding reading is a conjecture. When the accepted text is a conjecture which Jambūvijaya already made and adopted, the lemma sign is followed by 'conj. Jambū.'

The distinction between 'em.' and 'conj.' is one of degree, and thus subjective; cf. p. 54 above.

Policy with regard to 'accidentals,' variants which are not of substance, is the same as in the edition in Part I; see p. 53 above. In addition to the types of variation listed there, I have also not reported the use of *jihvāmūlīya* and *upadhmanīya* for *visarga* (exclusively, but not consistently, in the Śāradā manuscripts), nor differences in punctuation, i.e., use of *danḍas* and half-*danḍas*;³³ of course, if a variant reading is considered substantive it is given in the apparatus in the precise form found in the manuscript. In regard to the last point, it should be remarked that all the manuscripts so frequently punctuate in misleading or downright mistaken fashion, that it seems hardly possible to accord authority to any manuscript in this regard. The punctuation given, which aside from *danḍas* also includes commas and dashes, is therefore purely editorial.³⁴ Nonetheless, in the occasional dubious passage, manuscript punctuation could be taken into account, as at least giving clues as to how a scribe, who at the same time was a reader of the text and probably a user of Sanskrit,³⁵ construed the text.

In reporting the readings chosen by Jambūvijaya the corrections in the *śuddhipatṛakam* of the first edition have been taken into account.

To provide some further material for weighing the relation between J₁ and J₂, J₂ (including J₂⁵) has been included in the apparatus up to and including 1.1.6.

The lemmas given in the critical apparatus have sometimes been made rather longer than was strictly necessary; this was done with the consideration that the reader might thus more easily locate the variant in the text.

³³ And, in the case of Jambūvijaya's edition, commas and dashes.

³⁴ Be it remarked that in classical philology too experience is that none of the manuscripts—all of which, if we exclude papyrus fragments, date from many centuries after the composition of the text—can be regarded as preserving punctuation which reflects authorial usage.

³⁵ I do not of course suggest that all scribes knew Sanskrit or bothered themselves about how to construe the text they copied, but I believe there are indications that this may have been the case with the scribes of the four (independent) manuscript witnesses to this text.

2.6 The textual commentary

Rather than an annotated translation, I append to the text a commentary which, while not extremely detailed, is intended to point out and discuss briefly all significant problems of text and interpretation. The text is on the whole far less problematic than Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, dealt with in the previous part: the language is simpler, the thought less convoluted and the textual transmission somewhat less defective. Moreover, parts of Candrānanda's commentary are already available in translation,³⁶ and the work is in the main clear enough, I believe, that with occasional help from the commentary the reader should encounter no great difficulties. A new, complete and annotated translation, based on the text of the new edition, is perhaps a desideratum, but not at the moment a very urgent one I think.

All places where I have accepted a different reading in the constituted text from that printed by Jambūvijaya have been discussed. So too have the places where I follow Jambūvijaya in an emendation or conjecture against all the manuscripts, except for some cases where the rationale of the correction should be immediately clear and convincing. In some passages where my understanding of the text differs significantly from that suggested by Nozawa's translation I have also added an explanation.³⁷

The parallel passages occasionally adduced are in no sense a complete collection, nor are they intended as such. For the first two *adhyāyas* Nozawa has put together a quite impressive number of helpful parallel texts, and I have drawn gratefully on his labour. I have not however reproduced them all here, and at a few places I have added others. My commentary thus is intended in this regard to supplement rather than replace his notes on these *adhyāyas*.

Marginal numbers in bold-face refer to the sūtra numbering. Note that *avataraṇas* are reckoned as belonging to the sūtra they introduce.

36 See especially Nozawa 1993a, translating the first two *adhyāyas*, and Halbfass 1992, 238–246 (appendix 1), translating of the commentary on *adhyāya* 1 *āhnika* 2 and *adhyāya* 9 sūtras 1–12. Nozawa's M.A. thesis at the University of Madras contained an English translation of the entire commentary (personal communication: cf. Nozawa 1993a, 97b). This remains unpublished at present. In another unpublished M.A. thesis, I translated the commentary on 3.1.13, 3.2.1, 4.1.6–14, and the entire eighth *adhyāya* (Isaacson 1990, 15–25). Several individual passages, sometimes just a sentence or two, have been translated in various publications. I mention only the most extensive of these: Nozawa 1991, in addition to the commentary on 2.1.15–19 (which is also found translated in Nozawa 1993a) translates that on 3.2.6–14 as well.

37 Quite a few minor infelicities and inexactitudes of Nozawa's translation have been left unnoticed however.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I must acknowledge my indebtedness to quite a number of individuals and institutions for help in gaining access to the manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary: Muni Jambūvijaya, Prof. A. Wezler, Mr. D. Goodall, Dr. Śītāṃśu Rath, and the libraries of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, the BORI, the Oriental Institute, Baroda, and the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain. Once again I owe a great deal to Mr. C. Nenninger, Dr. K. Preisendanz and Prof. A. Wezler for their extremely helpful criticism and suggestions made during meetings at the University of Hamburg, in the summer semester of 1994, at which we read a draft of my edition of the first *adhyāya*. I profited also from helpful comments made by Prof. Dr. T. Vetter, Dr. H. T. Bakker and Mr. Dominic Goodall. Finally, I realize fully how much I have benefited from having Muni Jambūvijaya's work before me—without it this edition would have been much more unsatisfactory than it now is.

वैशेषिकसूत्रम् ।

चन्द्रानन्दविरचितवृत्तिसहितम् ।

प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य प्रथममाहिकम् ।

अथातो धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः । १ । १ । १ ।

कस्यचिद्ब्राह्मणस्य वेदाभ्यासवशेन व्यपगतकल्मषस्येदं प्रतिवभौ । अशरीरं वाव
सन्तं प्रियाप्रिये न स्पृशत इति । तत इदं वाक्यमालोच्य कणभक्षमाजगाम । ततो
ऽभ्युवाच । भगवन्ननेन वाक्येनापहतशरीरत्वस्य क्षेमसाधनता कथ्यते । तदुच्यतां
5 क उपाय इति । ततो मुनिरभ्युवाच । धर्म इति । ततो जगाद ब्राह्मणः । को धर्मः
कथंलक्षणः कान्यस्य साधनानि किंप्रयोजनः कांश्च प्रत्युपकरोतीति । अत एभ्यः
प्रश्नेभ्यो ऽनन्तरं धर्मव्याख्यानप्रतिज्ञायामथशब्द आनन्तर्यमभिधत्ते । अतःशब्दो
ऽपि वैराग्यप्रज्ञाकषायपरिपाकादिकां शिष्यगुणसम्पदं हेतुत्वेनापदिशति । यस्मा-
दयं शिष्यो गुणसम्पदा युक्तस्ततो ऽस्मै प्रश्नेभ्यो ऽनन्तरं धर्मं व्याख्यास्यामः ।
10 को धर्म इत्याह ।

यतो ऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः स धर्मः । १ । १ । २ ।

1.1.1 व्याख्यास्यामः] J₁J₂Ś, व्याख्यामः J₁J₂Ś 1.1.2 निःश्रेयसः] Ś, निःश्रेयसः J₁J₂Ś

2-3 अशरीरं ... स्पृशतः Chāndogvopaniṣad 8.12.1.

2 ब्राह्मणस्य] J₁J₂Ś₂Jambū., ब्राह्मणस्य Ś₁Ś₂, 2 वशेन] Ś, वशेने Ś₁Ś₂,
2 न्येदं] Ś, न्येदं वेदवाक्यं J₁J₂Jambū., 3 कणभक्षम्] J₁J₂Jambū., कणभक्षणम् Ś
4 भगवन्नेन] Ś, भगवन्नेनेन Ś₁Ś₂, 4 वाक्येनापहतः] J₁J₂Jambū., वाक्येन व्यपहतः Ś₁Ś₂,
वाक्येन व्यपगतः Ś₁, 4 शरीरत्वस्य] conj., शरीरस्य Ś, 5 धर्म इति] J₁J₂Ś₂Jambū.,
धर्म इति Ś₁, धर्ममिति Ś₂, 6 किंप्रयोजनः] ŚJambū., किंप्रयोजः J₁J₂Ś₂Jambū.,
किंप्रयोजनं J₁J₂Ś₂, 6 कांश्च प्रत्युपकरोतीति । अत] J₁J₂Jambū., कश्च प्रत्युपकरोति इत्यतः Ś
7 अनन्तरं] Ś, नन्तरे Ś₂, 7 शब्द आनन्तर्यम्] Ś, शब्द(या)नन्तर्यम् J₁, 7 आनन्तर्यमभि-
धत्ते] J₁J₂Jambū., आनन्तर्यार्थमभिधत्ते Ś₁Ś₂, आनन्तर्यार्थमभिधत्ते Ś₂, 8 अतःशब्दो ऽपि]
ŚJambū., अतःशब्दोपि । अतःशब्दोपि J₁J₂, 8 कषायः] Ś, कषा(य)ः J₁, कषा-
J₁J₂Ś₂Jambū., 8 शिष्यगुणसम्पदं] J₁J₂Jambū., शिष्यगतसम्पदं Ś

यागदेवतापूजादिक्रियाणामाज्यपुष्पादिनिर्वर्त्यानां तदैव विनष्टत्वादुत्तरकालं फलदानाशक्तेर्यस्माद्धेतोरभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसे भवतः स धर्म इति वोद्धव्यः। अभ्युदयो ब्रह्मादिलोकेषु चेष्टशरीरप्राप्तिरनर्थोपरमश्च। निःश्रेयसमप्यात्मनो वैशेषिकगुणाभावरूपो मोक्षः।

कुत एवंलक्षणो धर्मो ज्ञायत इति चेत्। आम्नायात्। तस्य प्रामाण्यं ५
कथमित्याह—

तद्वचनादाम्नायप्रामाण्यम्। १।१।३।

तदिति हिरण्यगर्भपरामर्शः। हिरण्यं रेतो ऽस्येति कृत्वा भगवान्महेश्वर एवोच्यते। आम्नेनोक्तत्वस्य सत्यताव्याप्तत्वादिहाप्तेन हिरण्यगर्भेणोक्तत्वादाम्नायस्य प्रामाण्यं साध्यते। ईश्वरश्च साधितस्तनुभुवनादीनां कार्यतया घटादिवद्बुद्धिमत्कर्तृकत्वानु- 10
मानेन।

उक्तं धर्मस्वरूपं तल्लक्षणं च। साधनान्यस्येदानीं द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि वक्ष्यामः।
तत्र—

पृथिव्यापस्तेजो वायुराकाशं कालो दिगात्मा मन इति द्रव्या-
णि। १।१।४।

15

द्रव्यत्वाभिसम्बन्धाद्द्रव्याणि। पृथिवीत्वाभिसम्बन्धात्पृथिवी। एवमवादिसंज्ञाः। न-

1.1.3 °प्रामाण्यम्] Σ. °प्रामर्शः Ś. 1.1.4 पृथिव्यापस्तेजो] J₁[°]J₂[°]Jambū., पृथिव्यापा-
स्तेजो J₁[°]°, पृथिव्यापस्तेजो J₁, पृथिव्याप्तेजो Ś₁[°]Ś₂, पृथिव्यप्तेजो Ś₁[°]Ś₃.

1 °पूजादि°] Σ. पूजाति° Ś. 1 °क्रियाणामाज्य°] ŚJambū., °क्रियाणामाज्या° J₁J₂
1 निर्वर्त्यानां] J₁J₂Jambū., निर्वर्त्यानां Ś. 1 तदैव] J₁J₂Ś₂Jambū., क तदैव Ś₁, कदैव
Ś₃. 1 विनष्टत्वाद्] Σ. निष्टत्वाद् Ś₃. 2 फलदानाशक्तेर्] ŚJambū., फलदानाशक्तेर् J₁J₂
2 °निःश्रेयसे] J₁Jambū., °निःश्रेयसे J₂, °निःश्रेयसौ Ś. 2 वोद्धव्यः] Ś₃J₁J₂Jambū.,
वोद्धव्यः Ś₁Ś₂. 3 °लोकेषु चेष्ट°] Ś, °लोकेष्विष्ट° J₁J₂Jambū. 3 निःश्रेयसमप्यात्मनो]
Ś. निःश्रेयसमप्यात्मनो J₁J₂Jambū. 3 वैशेषिक°] J₁J₂Jambū., वैशेषिका° Ś₁Ś₂Ś₃[°], वै-
शिषिका° Ś₃[°]. 5 प्रामाण्यं] Σ. प्रामाण्य Ś. 8 °परामर्शः] Σ. °प्रामाण्यपरामर्शः] Ś₂
8 ऽस्येति] Σ. स्यति Ś. 8 भगवान्] J₁J₂Jambū., श्रीभगवान् Ś. 9 सत्यताव्याप्तत्वाद्]
J₁J₂Jambū., सत्यव्याप्तत्वाद् Ś₁[°]Ś₂, सत्यव्याप्यत्वाद् Ś₁[°]Ś₃. 12 द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि] ŚJambū.,
द्रव्याणि J₁J₂. 16 °सम्बन्धाद्द्रव्याणि] Ś₁Ś₂Jambū., °सम्बन्धत्वाद्द्रव्याणि] Ś₃, °संबन्धाद्-
व्याणि J₁J₂. 16 पृथिवीत्वा°... द्रव्याणि om. J₁J₂(eyeskip) 16 पृथिवीत्वाभिसम्बन्धात्]
em. Jambū., पृथिवीत्वादिसम्बन्धात् Ś₁Ś₂, पृथिवीत्वादिसम्बन्धत्वात् Ś₃. 16 एवमवादि°]
J₁J₂Jambū., एवमेव {एवं एव Ś₁} सर्वादि° Ś. 16 °संज्ञाः] em., °संज्ञा Σ

वैव द्रव्याणि नाधिकानीत्येवमर्थमिति शब्दः ।

एवमुद्दिष्टानि द्रव्याणि । के पुनर्गुणा इत्याह —

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शाः सङ्ख्याः परिमाणानि पृथक्त्वं संयोगविभा-
गौ परत्वापरत्वे बुद्ध्यः सुखदुःखे इच्छाद्वेषौ प्रयत्नश्च गु-
णाः । १ । १ । ५ ।

एते सप्तदश कण्ठोक्ता रूपादयो गुणाः । चशब्दसमुच्चिताश्च गुरुत्वद्रवत्वस्नेहसंस्कारधर्माधर्मशब्दा गृह्यन्ते । एते यथावसरमुत्तरत्र वक्ष्यन्ते ।

कानि पुनः कर्माणीत्याह —

उत्क्षेपणमपक्षेपणमाकुञ्चनं प्रसारणं गमनमिति कर्मा-
णि । १ । १ । ६ ।

एतान्येव पञ्च कर्माणि द्रष्टव्यानि । गमनग्रहणाद्गमणरेचनादीनां ग्रहणम् ।

एवमुद्दिष्टानि द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि । तदनुषङ्गात्सामान्यविशेषसमवाया अपि वक्ष्यन्ते । एवं षण्णां पदार्थानां साधर्म्यवैधर्म्यपरिज्ञानं विषयदोषदर्शनद्वारेण वैराग्योत्पत्तौ सत्यां निःश्रेयसे साध्ये धर्महेतुः । अभ्युदये साध्ये धर्महेतुत्वं पुनरमीषां समे यजेतेति पृथिव्याः । अधो ऽम्बूनि नयतीत्यादि यथास्वमन्येषां द्रव्याणाम् । गुणानां तु कृष्णमालभेतेत्यादि । कर्मणां तु ब्रीहीनवहन्तीत्यादि ।

विज्ञातसाधर्म्यवैधर्म्याणां च द्रव्यादीनामभ्युदयनिःश्रेयसहेतुत्वात्साधर्म्यं

1.1.5 सङ्ख्याः] J₁⁵J₂⁵Jambū., सङ्ख्या J₁J₂Ś 1.1.5 परत्वापरत्वे] J₁J₁⁵J₂Jambū., परत्वापरत्वे Ś, परत्वे J₂⁵ 1.1.6 उत्क्षेपणमपक्षेपणम्] Ś, उत्क्षेपणमपक्षेपणम् J₁⁵J₂⁵J₁J₂Jambū.

15 समे यजेत Untraced.

15 अधो ऽम्बूनि नयति Untraced.

16 कृष्णमालभेते Untraced.

16 ब्रीहीनवहन्ति Untraced; cf. Edgerton 1929. 29.

1 नाधिकानी°] ŚJ₁⁵Jambū., नाधिका+नी+(री)° J₁, नाधिकानीरी° J₂ 6 गुरुत्वद्रवत्व°] J₁J₂Jambū., गुरुत्वद्रवत्वे Ś₁Ś₂, गुरुद्रवत्वे Ś₃ 11 एतान्येव ... द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि] om. J₂ 12 तदनुषङ्गात्] ŚJambū., तदनुषङ्गात् J₁J₂ 14 अभ्युदये] em. Jambū., अभ्युदय J₁J₂, अभ्युपगमे Ś 15 पृथिव्याः । अधो ऽम्बूनि] conj. Jambū., पृथिव्याः । असौवनि J₁J₂, पृथिव्या अधोवनि Ś₁Ś₂, पृथिव्याधोवनि Ś₃ 15 यथास्वम्] Ś, स्वम् Ś₁ 16 तु] Ś, om. J₂ 16 कृष्णमालभेते°] J₁Jambū., कृष्णमालभेते° Ś₁, कृष्णमालभ्येते° Ś₂, कृष्णमालभ्येते° Ś₃, कृष्णमालभते° J₂ 17 विज्ञात°] J₁J₂Jambū., निज्ञात° Ś₁Ś₂, निज्ञात Ś₃ (sic)

तावत्कथयति—

सदनित्यं द्रव्यवत्कार्यं कारणं सामान्यविशेषवदिति द्रव्यगुण-
कर्मणामविशेषः । १।१।७।

सद्व्यं सन्गुणः सत्कर्मेति सत्ता त्रयाणामविशेषः । तथैवानित्यत्वमन्यत्राका-
शादिभ्यः । द्रव्यवदिति समवायिकारणवत्त्वमविशेषः परमाण्वाकाशादिवर्जम् । 5
कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भवनं तथैवाविशेषो ऽन्यत्र नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः । कारणत्वं कार्यजन-
कत्वं त्रयाणामविशेषः । क्षित्यादीनि द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समवायिकारणमाकाशादीनि
गुणानां मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये गुणकर्मणाम् । गुणास्तु रूपरसगन्धानुष्णस्पर्शस-
ङ्ख्यापरिमाणैकपृथक्त्वेहशब्दा असमवायिकारणं बुद्धिसुखदुःखेच्छाद्वेषप्रयत्नधर्मा-
धर्मभावना निमित्तकारणं संयोगविभागौष्ण्यगुरुत्वद्रवत्ववेगा उभयथा कारणम् । 10
परत्वापरत्वद्वित्वद्विपृथक्त्वापरिमाण्डल्यादयो ऽकारणम् । कर्माणि संयोगविभा-
गेष्वसमवायिकारणम् । सामान्यानि च तानि द्रव्यत्वादीनि विशेषाश्च त इति
सामान्यविशेषाः । तद्वत्ता त्रयाणामविशेषः ।

त्रयाणामेकत्वे प्राप्ते वैधर्म्यमुच्यते । तथा हि—

द्रव्याणि द्रव्यान्तरमारभन्ते । १।१।८।

15

द्रव्ये च द्रव्याणि चेति विग्रहादेकमनारम्भकम् । समवायिकारणानि द्रव्याणि स्वा-

1.1.7 द्रव्यगुणकर्मणामविशेषः] J₁J₂¹Jambū., द्रव्यगुणं कर्मणां सविशेषः Ś₁, द्रव्यगुणं कर्मणा-
मविशेषः Ś₂, द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां सविशेषस् Ś₃

4 सद्व्यं ... त्रयाणामविशेषः] om. Ś 4 सद्व्यं] em. Jambū., सद्व्यं J₁ 5 समवा-
यिकारणवत्त्वमविशेषः] Σ, समवायिकारणवत्त्वमविशेषः Ś₃ 5 परमाण्वाकाशादिवर्जम्] Σ,
परमाण्वा(दि)काशा+दि+वर्ज J₁ (added दि sec. man.) 6 कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भवनं] J₁Jambū.,
कार्यत्वमभावने Ś₁Ś₃, कार्यत्वमभूत्वा भावनं Ś₂ 6 नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः] J₁Jambū., हि नित्यद्र-
व्येभ्यः Ś₁, हि नित्यद्रव्येभ्यः Ś₃, हिद्रव्येभ्यः Ś₂ 7 कारणत्वं कार्यजनकत्वं] J₁Jambū.,
कार्यत्वे कार्यजनकत्वे Ś 7 °काशादीनि] Σ, °काशादीन Ś₃ 8 गुणास्तु] Σ, गुणोस्तु
J₁ 9 °प्रयत्न°] J₁Jambū., om. Ś 10 °भावना] Ś₃J₁Jambū., °भाविना Ś₁, °भाविहा
Ś₂ 10 °द्रवत्ववेगा उभयथा] J₁Jambū., °द्रव्यत्ववेगा उभयथा Ś₁Ś₂, °द्रव्यत्वयोगेनोभयथा
Ś₃ 10 कारणम्] Σ, करणम् Ś₁ 11 °परिमाण्डल्यादयो] em. Jambū., °परिमण्डल्या-
दयो Ś₁Ś₂, °परिमण्डल्यादयः Ś₃, °परिमण्डल्यादयो J₁ 12 द्रव्यत्वादीनि] J₁Jambū.,
द्रव्यादीनि Ś 12 त इति] J₁Jambū., ते इति Ś 13 तद्वत्ता त्रयाणाम्] Ś₂J₁Jambū., तद्व-
त्तत्रयाणाम् Ś₁, तद्वत्त्रयाणाम् Ś₃ 14 त्रयाणामेकत्वे प्राप्ते वैधर्म्यम्] J₁ (°म्याम् J₁¹) Jambū.,
त्रयाणामेकत्वप्राप्तेस्सैधर्म्यम् Ś (°प्राप्तेः Ś₃) 14 वैधर्म्यम्] Σ, वैधर्म्याम् J₁¹

त्मव्यतिरिक्तं कार्यद्रव्यमारभन्ते । आकाशाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि तु द्रव्यं नाग्भन्ते
तुल्यजातीयानां मूर्तिक्रियारूपादिमतां द्वयोर्वहूनां वा कारणानां कार्यारम्भकत्वात् ।
न चैवंविधान्याकाशादीनि । मनसो ऽस्पर्शवत्त्वाद्द्रव्याकारणत्वमन्त्यावयविद्रव्या-
णां चादृष्टत्वात् ।

5 गुणाश्च गुणान्तरम् । १।१।९ ।

गुणौ च गुणाश्चेति पूर्ववत् । यथा तन्तुरूपादयः स्वात्रयसमवेते पटद्रव्यं रूपादि-
गुणानात्मव्यतिरिक्तानारभन्ते ।

कर्म कर्मसाध्यं न विद्यते । १।१।१० ।

न कर्मणा कर्म जन्येत कर्मणामुपरमदर्शनात् । कर्मारम्भे हि कर्मणां निष्क्रमणो
10 द्रव्यस्यानुपलम्भः स्यात् ।

एवं कानिचिद्द्रव्याण्यारम्भकानि कानिचित्तैव । गुणाः केचित्कारणं केचित्तैव ।
कर्माणि नैव कर्मकारणमित्येतद्वैधर्म्यम् ।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमाह—

कार्याविरोधि द्रव्यं कारणाविरोधि च । १।१।११ ।

15 विनाशो विरोधः, प्रतिबन्धः क्वचित् । द्रव्यादिना कार्येण कारणद्रव्यं समवाय्यस-
मवायिकारणाभ्यां च न विरुध्यते । तथा ह्यङ्गुलिद्रव्यं कार्यं ह्यङ्गुलं जनयिष्यत्तदर्थेन

1.1.11 कार्याविरोधि] ŚJ⁵ Jambū. कार्याविरोधे J⁵ J¹. 1.1.11 कारणाविरोधि च] J⁵ Ja-
mbū. कारणाविरोधे च J⁵, कारणविरोधे वा J¹, कारणविरोधि Ś

1 °व्यतिरिक्ते] Σ. °व्यतिरिक्ते Ś. 1 कार्यद्रव्यमारभन्ते] (तुल्यजातीयानां) add. Ś. 1 आ-
काशाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि] J¹ Jambū. आकाशान्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि Ś¹. आकाशान्त्यावयविद्र-
व्याणि Ś². आकाशान्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि Ś³. 1 तु द्रव्यं] J¹ Jambū. द्रव्यं तु Ś¹ Ś². द्रव्यं तु
Ś² Ś³. 2 मूर्ति°] Σ. मुक्ति° J¹. 2 द्वयोर्वहूनां] Σ. द्वयोर्वहूनां J¹. 3 °विधान्याकाशा°
Σ. °विधान्याकाशा° Ś³. 3 °त्वाद्द्रव्या°] Σ. °त्वाद्द्रव्या° J¹. 4 चादृष्टत्वात्] J¹ Jambū.
च दृष्टत्वात् Ś¹ Ś². च दृष्टत्वात् Ś³. 6 तन्तु°] Σ. तन्तु° J¹. 7 रूपादिगुणानात्मव्यतिरिक्ता-
नारभन्ते] J¹ Jambū. रूपादिगुणावात्मव्यतिरिक्तानारभन्ते Ś¹ Ś². रूपादिगुणावात्मव्यतिरिक्ता-
नारभन्ते Ś³. 9 कर्मणा] Σ. कर्मणा J¹. 9 जन्येत] Ś¹ Ś². जन्येत Ś³. जन्येत J¹ Jambū.
9 कर्मणां] Σ. कर्मणां J¹. 10 °लम्भः स्यात्] Σ. °लम्भात् J¹. 11 एवं] J¹. एवं च
कार्येण] J¹ Jambū. द्रव्यादिकार्येण Ś 16 समवाय्यसमवायि°] Σ. समवायि असमवायि°
J¹. 16 च] J¹ Jambū. om. Ś 16 जनयिष्यत्तदर्थेन] Ś¹ Ś² Jambū. जनयिष्यत्तदर्थेन Ś³.

कर्मणा तत्कृतेन संयोगेन ततो जातेन द्वाङ्गुलेन न विरुध्यते नापि समवाय्य-
समवायिकारणाभ्यां पर्वतत्संयोगाभ्यां वा । मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि गुणकर्मभिः
कार्यैराकाशादीनि गुणैर्नित्यत्वादेशां न कारणविरोधः ।

उभयथा गुणः । १ । १ । १२ ।

कार्यकारणोभयानुभयैरविरोधी विरोधी च । परमाणुद्व्यणुकाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्येषु
रूपादयः कार्योभयकारणैरविरोधिनो यथासम्भवम् । रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा अका-
र्यकारणभूता अविरोधिनः परस्परेण । विरोधिन आद्यमध्यान्त्यशब्दाः कार्योभय-
कारणैः । अदृष्टः कार्येण, स्पर्शवद्द्रव्यसंयोगेन वेगप्रयत्नौ, संयोगविभागौ सुखदुःखे
इच्छाद्वेषौ परस्परतो ऽकार्यकारणभूतौ विरुध्यते ज्ञानं संस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः
संस्कारो ज्ञानमददुःखादिभिरिति यथासम्भवमेतद्विद्रव्यम् ।

कार्यविरोधि कर्म । १ । १ । १३ ।

संयोगविभागसंस्काराणां कार्याणां मध्यात्संयोगेनैव कर्म विरुध्यते न विभाग-
संस्काराभ्यां संयोगानुत्पत्तिप्रसङ्गात् ।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमपि —

१.१.१३ कार्यविरोधि] ऽJ₁⁵⁷°Jambū., कार्यविरोधे J₁⁵⁷°J₁

१ कर्मणा] Σ. कर्मणो J₁ १ जातेन] Σ. जातेन ऽ₂ २ पर्वतत्संयोगाभ्यां] em. Jambū.,
पर्वतः संयोगाभ्यां J₁, पूर्ववत्संयोगाभ्यां ऽ₁ऽ₃, पूर्ववत्संयोगाभ्यां ऽ₂ २ मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्या-
णि] J₁Jambū., मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्याणि ऽ ५ °नुभयैरविरोधी] J₁Jambū., °नुभयो विरोधी
ऽ ६ °द्व्यणुकाद्यन्त्यावयविद्रव्येषु रूपादयः] J₁Jambū., °द्व्य(नु)णुकान्त्यावयविद्रव्येष्वरूपा-
दयः ऽ₁, °द्व्यणुकान्त्यावयविद्रव्ये स्वरूपादयः ऽ₂ऽ₃ ६ °न्त्यावयवि°] Σ., °न्त्यवयवि°
J₁⁵⁷ ६ रूपादयः] Σ. रूपाद+यः+ J₁ ६ कार्योभयकारणैरविरोधिनो] em. Jambū., का-
रणैरविरोधिनो J₁, कार्योभयकारणैर्विरोधिनो ऽ ७ °स्पर्शा अकार्य°] J₁Jambū., °स्पर्शा
आकार्य° ऽ₁ऽ₃, °स्पर्शाकार्य° ऽ₂ (unclear mark under the आ of शा) ७ अविरोधिनः]
Σ. अविरोधेनः J₁ ७ परस्परेण । विरोधिन] em. Jambū., परस्परेण विरोधेन J₁, पर-
स्परेणाविरोधिनः ऽ ७ आद्यमध्यान्त्य] J₁Jambū., आद्याध्यान्त्य° ऽ ८ °कारणैः] Σ.
°कारणोः J₁ ८ अदृष्टः कार्येण] Σ. अदृष्टकार्येण ऽ₂ ९ परस्परतो ऽकार्य°] ऽ₁ऽ₂Jambū.,
परस्परतः कार्य° ऽ₃J₁⁵⁷ ९ °कारणभूतौ] Σ. °करणभूतौ ऽ₂ ९ विरुध्यते] Σ. विरुद्धते
J₁ ९ ज्ञानं संस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः] J₁Jambū., ज्ञानसंस्कारसत्तानप्रतिपक्षैः ऽ₁ऽ₃, ज्ञान-
संस्कारसन्तानप्रतिपक्षैः ऽ₂ १० ज्ञानमददुःखा°] Σ. ज्ञानसु(ख)दुःखा° ऽ₃ (doubtful syllable
could also be । (ब्द)) १२ कार्याणां मध्यात्संयोगेनैव] J₁Jambū., कार्याणामध्यात्मयोगेनैव ऽ
१३ °संस्काराभ्यां संयोगानुत्पत्ति°] J₁Jambū., °संस्काराभ्याम{°भ्याम° ऽ₂}नुत्पत्ति° ऽ

क्रियावद्गुणवत्समवायिकारणमिति द्रव्यलक्षणम् । १।१।१४ ।

उत्क्षेपणादिकं कर्म क्रिया यथासम्भवं यस्मिन्यत्समवायेन वर्तते तत्क्रियावद-
न्यत्राकाशकालदिगात्मभ्यः । गुणा रूपादयो यत्र यथासम्भवं वर्तन्ते तद्गुणवत् ।
अयुतसिद्धानामाधार्याधारभूतानामिहेति यतः स समवायः, स यस्यास्ति तत्स-
मवायि कारणं च तदेव, समवायिनो वा, कार्यस्य कारणम् । तत्र क्षित्यादीनि
त्रयाणां द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समवायिकारणमाकाशादीनि गुणानां मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये
गुणकर्मणाम् ।

द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान्संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इति गुणलक्ष-
णम् । १।१।१५ ।

10 द्रव्यमाश्रयतीति द्रव्याश्रयी । अगुणवान्निर्गुणः । संयोगविभागेष्वकारणमनपेक्ष इ-
ति सापेक्षः कारणम् । तथा हि—अङ्गुल्योराकाशसंयोगो द्वाङ्गुलाकाशसंयोगे
कर्तव्ये द्वाङ्गुलोत्पत्तिमपेक्षते अङ्गुल्योः परस्परविभागो द्वाङ्गुलाकाशविभागं प्रति
कार्यविनाशमपेक्षते । एवं संयोगविभागलक्षण एव गुणः संयोगविभागेषु सापेक्षः
कारणम् ।

15 एकद्रव्यमगुणं संयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षं कारणमिति कर्मलक्षण-
म् । १।१।१६ ।

एकमस्य कर्मणो द्रव्यमाश्रयो न द्वे, एकमेव वा द्रव्ये वर्तत इत्येकद्रव्यम् । नास्य

1.1.15 द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान्] Ś; J; J; Jambū.. द्रव्याश्रय्यगुणवान् Ś; Ś. 1.1.16 कर्मलक्षणम्] Σ.
कल्पलक्षणं J;

2 'वायेन] Σ. 'वेयेन Ś; 2 वर्तते तत्क्रियावद्] Σ. वर्तते (possibly वर्तते, इति क्रियावत्
Ś; 3 काशकालदिगात्मभ्यः] Ś; Jambū.. 'काशकालादिगात्मभ्यः J; 'कालकान्ता(न-
Ś;)दिगादिभ्यः Ś 3 गुणा] Ś; J; Jambū.. गुण Ś; Ś; 3 यत्र] Σ. added i.m. Ś; 3 य-
थासम्भवं] Σ. +यथा+संभवं J; 3 वर्तन्ते] J; Jambū.. वर्तते Ś (Ś; blotched, conceivably
corrected from वर्तन्ते) 4 स समवायः] Ś; समवायः J; Ś; Ś; [स] समवायः Jambū.
5 कारणं] Ś; J; Jambū.. कारणे Ś; Ś; 5 तदेव समवायिनो] Ś; Ś; Jambū.. तदेव समवायिनो
J; तदेवासमवायिनो Ś; 6 द्रव्यम्] Σ, om. Ś; 11 सापेक्षः] Σ. सापेक्ष J; 11 तथा
हि अङ्गुल्योर्] J; Jambū.. तथाङ्गुल्योर् Ś 12 'संयोगो द्वाङ्गुलाकाशसंयोगे कर्तव्ये] J; Ja-
mbū.. 'संयोगो द्वाङ्गुलाकारे Ś 12 'उत्पत्तिमपेक्षते] Σ. 'उत्पत्तिमपेक्षते J; 12 अङ्गुल्योः ...
'पेक्षते] Σ. om. Ś; 12 अङ्गुल्योः] Ś; J; Jambū.. अङ्गुल्योः Ś; 12 'विभागो] Ś; J; Ja-
mbū.. 'विभागो Ś; 13 'विनाशमपेक्षते] Ś; Jambū.. 'विनाशमपेक्षते J; 'विनाशमपेक्षते Ś;
13 संयोगविभागलक्षण] Σ. संयोगविभाग Ś; 17 एकमस्य] J; Jambū.. एकस्य Ś 17 वा
द्रव्ये] Σ. नाद्रव्ये J;

गुणाः सन्तीत्यगुणम् । संयोगविभागेषु कार्येषु स्वस्याश्रयस्यान्यतो विभज्याश्रयान्तरेण संयोजनादुत्पाद्यविनाश्यानपेक्षया संयोगविभागेष्वनपेक्षं कारणमिति ।

वैधर्म्यान्तरमपि—

द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां द्रव्यं कारणं सामान्यम् । १।१।१७ ।

सामान्यशब्दः समानपर्यायः । क्षित्यादीनि त्रयाणां कारणं समानम् । आका- 5
शादीनां केवलगुणकारणत्वे ऽप्येकैकस्यानेकगुणत्वादाकाशादीनि समानं गुणेषु
कारणम् । मनोन्त्यावयविद्रव्ये गुणकर्मणाम् ।

तथा गुणः । १।१।१८ ।

संयोगानां द्रव्यमित्यग्निसंयोगाद्गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावादित्यात्मसंयोगप्रयत्नाभ्यां हस्ते
कर्मेति वाक्येभ्यः संयोग एव द्रव्यगुणकर्मणां समानं कारणं नान्यो गुणः । तथा 10
हि तूलपिण्डस्य वेगवता तूलेन संयोगात्कर्म द्वितूलकद्रव्यं तत्र च परिमाणं
महदुत्पद्यते । अन्ये गुणा यथायोगम् ।

संयोगविभागानां कर्म । १।१।१९ ।

स्वाश्रयमन्यतो विभज्याश्रयान्तरेण संयोजयत्यतः संयोगविभागानां समानं का-
रणं कर्म । 15

न द्रव्याणां व्यतिरेकात् । १।१।२० ।

1.1.17 द्रव्यं] Ś₂J₁J₁^f. द्रव्य Ś₁Ś₃ 1.1.19 संयोग°] Σ, योग° Ś₂

9 संयोगानां द्रव्यम् VS 1.1.25.

9 अग्निसंयोगाद्गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावाद् Reference to VS 7.1.5-6 अग्निसंयोगाच्च । ७ । १ । ५ ।
गुणान्तरप्रादुर्भावात् । ७ । १ । ६ ।

10 आत्मसंयोगप्रयत्नाभ्यां हस्ते कर्म VS 5.1.1.

1 गुणाः सन्तीत्यगुणम्] J₁Jambū.. गुणास्सन्त्यस्यागुणम् Ś₁, गुणस्सन्त्यस्यागुणम् Ś₂, गु-
णाः सन्त्यस्यागुणं Ś₃ 1 स्वस्याश्रयस्यान्यतो] J₁Jambū., स्वाश्रयतो Ś₁, स्वस्याश्रयतो Ś₂Ś₃
2 °दुत्पाद्यविनाश्या°] Σ, °दुत्पाद्यविनाश्या° J₁ 5 क्षित्यादीनि] ŚJambū.. क्षित्या । दीनि
J₁^f. क्षित्या । दीनां J₁^f 6 °कैकस्यानेक°] Σ, °कैकस्यनेक° Ś₁ 6 °गुणत्वादाकाशादीनि]
Σ, °गुणत्वाकाशादीनि J₁ 6 समानं गुणेषु] J₁Jambū., समानगुणेषु Ś 7 °कर्मणाम्]
Ś₂J₁Jambū.. °कर्मकाणाम् Ś₁Ś₃ 11 वेगवता] J₁Jambū., वेगवत्ता Ś 11 तूलेन] Σ,
तूलेन J₁ 12 महदुत्पद्यते] J₁Jambū., महानुत्पद्यते Ś 14 स्वाश्रयमन्यतो] J₁Jambū..
स्वाश्रयमस्य यतो Ś₁Ś₂. स्वाश्रयस्य यतो Ś₃

यदि खलु द्रव्यस्य कारणं कर्म भवेत्तथा सति कृत्वापि संयोगं न निवर्तेत । निवृत्ते तु कर्मणि केवलस्य संयोगस्योपलम्भान्मन्यामहे न द्रव्यकारणं कर्म ।

गुणवैधर्म्यान्न कर्मणाम् । १।१।२१।

गुरुत्वद्रवत्वनोदनाभिघातसंयुक्तसंयोगाः स्वाश्रये पराश्रये च कर्मकारणं प्रय-
त्नादृष्टौ तु पराश्रय एव । तत्र न तावत्कर्म स्वाश्रये कर्मकारणं, निष्क्रियद्र-
व्यानुपलब्धिप्रसङ्गात् । नापि पराश्रये तत्संयोगेनैव निवर्तितत्वात् । तस्मादेतैः
कर्मकारणैर्गुणैर्वैधर्म्यान्न कर्म कर्मकारणम् ।

अपरं वैधर्म्यम्—

द्रव्याणां द्रव्यं कार्यं सामान्यम् । १।१।२२।

सजातीयानां द्वयोर्वहूनां वा द्रव्याणां द्रव्यं तन्तूनामिव पटः समानं कार्यम् ।

द्वित्वप्रभृतयश्च सङ्ख्याः पृथक् संयोगविभागाश्च । १।१।२३।

द्वयोर्द्रव्ययोर्द्वित्वं सामान्यं कार्यं त्रयाणां त्रित्वमित्यादि । तथैव द्विपृथक्त्वादि ।
द्वयोर्द्रव्ययोः संयुज्यमानयोः संयोगो विभज्यमानयोर्विभागः । एषामनेकाश्रित-
त्वात्समानत्वम् ।

असमवायात्सामान्यं कर्म कार्यं न विद्यते । १।१।२४।

अनेकस्मिन्द्रव्य एकस्य कर्मणः समवायनिषेधान्न द्रव्याणां द्विवहूनां कर्म समानं
कार्यमस्ति ।

1.1.21 गुणवैधर्म्यान्न] Σ, गुणवैधर्म्यान्न J¹ 1.1.23 सङ्ख्याः] J¹Jambū., सङ्ख्या J;Ś 1.1.23
संयोगविभागाश्च] ŚJambū., संयोगविभागाश्च J¹, संयोगविभागाश्च J; 1.1.24 कर्म कार्यं]
Σ, कार्यं कर्म J¹

1 भवेत्तथा] Σ, भवेत्तथा Ś; 1 संयोगं न] J;Jambū., संयोगेन Ś 1 निवर्तेत] Σ, नि-
वर्तेत+त+ J; 2 तु] J;Jambū., om. Ś 4 द्रवत्वनोदना°] J;Jambū., द्रव्यत्वनोदना°
Ś;Ś; 5 द्रव्यत्वनोदना° Ś; 4 संयोगाः स्वाश्रये] Ś;J;Jambū., संयोगात्स्वाश्रये Ś;Ś;
5 तत्र न] conj.; तत्र J;ŚJambū. 5 स्वाश्रये] Σ, [न] स्वाश्रये Jambū. (conj.) 7 कर्म
कर्मकारणम्] J;Jambū., कर्मकारणम् Ś 10 वा] Σ, om. J; 10 द्रव्यं] Σ, om. Ś;
10 तन्तूनामिव] Ś;Ś;Ś;Jambū., तन्तूनां व Ś;Ś; 10 तन्तूनामिव] J; 13 द्रव्ययोः] Σ, द्रव्ययो
Ś; 13 संयुज्यमानयोः] J;Jambū., संयुज्यमानयोः {°ये: Ś; } Ś 13 विभज्यमानयोर्] Σ,
विभज्यमानयोर् J¹ 13 एषाम्] Σ, एषम् J; 16 अनेकस्मिन्द्रव्य] Σ, अनेकस्मिन्द्रव्य
J; 16 निषेधान्न द्रव्याणां] J;Jambū., निषेधाद्द्रव्याणां Ś

संयोगानां द्रव्यम् । १।१।२५ ।

द्वयोर्वहूनां वासमवायिकारणानां संयोगानां द्रव्यं समानं कार्यं तन्तुसंयोगानामिव पटः ।

रूपाणां रूपम् । १।१।२६ ।

द्वयोर्वहूनां वा कारणरूपाणां कार्यद्रव्याश्रितं रूपं समानं कार्यं यथा घटरूपं ५
कपालरूपाणाम् । एवं रसादीनाम् ।

गुरुत्वप्रयत्नसंयोगानामुत्क्षेपणम् । १।१।२७ ।

आदित्यरश्मीनामगुरुत्वात्पर्वतस्य तथाभूतप्रयत्नाभावाल्लोष्टस्य च हस्तेनासंयुक्त-
त्वादनुत्क्षेपणमिति गुरुत्वादीनामुत्क्षेपणं समानं कार्यम् ।

संयोगविभागाः कर्मणाम् । १।१।२८ ।

10

उभयकर्मजा ये संयोगा विभागाश्च ते कर्मणां समानं कार्यम् ।

कारणसामान्ये द्रव्यकर्मणां कर्माकारणमुक्तम् । १।१।२९ ।

यस्मिन्प्रकरणे द्रव्यादीनां कारणं समानं वर्णितं तस्मिन्कारणसामान्ये द्रव्यकर्मणां
यतः कर्माकारणमुक्तमतस्तान्यप्यस्य कार्यं सामान्यं न भवन्तीति । एवं नाना
द्रव्यगुणकर्माणीति सिद्धम् ।

15

॥ प्रथमस्याध्यायस्याद्यमाहिकम् ॥

1.1.27 *संयोगानामुत्क्षेपणम्] Ś, Ś^o Jambū., *संयोगानामुत्क्षेपणं J₁, *संयोगा{ *ग Ś^o } ना-
मुत्क्षेपणम् Ś₁, *संयोगानामुत्क्षेपणां Ś^o 1.1.28 संयोगविभागाः] Σ, संयोगविभागाः Ś₁
1.1.28 कर्मणाम्] Σ, कर्मणां J^o 1.1.28 *विभागाः कर्मणाम्] Σ, *विभागात्कर्मणाम् J^o
1.1.29 कारणसामान्ये] J₁ J^o Jambū., कारणसामान्यैर् Ś 1.1.29 द्रव्यकर्मणां] (कर्मणां) add.
J^o 1.1.29 कर्माकारणमुक्तम्] em., कर्माकारणमुक्तमिति J₁ Ś Jambū.

5 द्वयोर्] Σ, द्वयो J₁ 6 कपाल°] J₁ Jambū., कल्यापाल° Ś₁ Ś₂, कन्यापाल° Ś₃ 8 प-
र्वतस्य] conj., पर्वते Σ! 9 *नुत्क्षेपणमिति] conj. Jambū., *नुत्क्षेपणासति J₁, *नुत्क्षेपणे
सति Ś 9 गुरुत्वादीनाम्] Ś₃ J₁ Jambū., गुरुत्वादीनाम् Ś₁ Ś₂ 11 ते] J₁ Jambū., भेद Ś
13 प्रकरणे] Σ, प्रकरण{ *णं? } J₁ 14 कार्यं] J₁ Jambū., कार्यं Ś

प्रथमस्याध्यायस्य द्वितीयमाह्निकम् ।

कार्यकारणशब्दौ पूर्वमुक्तौ । तन्निरूपणार्थमाह —

कारणाभावात्कार्याभावः । १ । २ । १ ।

यस्याभावात्तन्त्वादेः समवायिकारणस्य तत्संयोगानां वा समवायिकारणानां कार्यद्रव्यं न जायते पटादि, विनाशे वा विनश्यति, तत्कारणमन्यत्कार्यम् ।

5 न तु कार्याभावात्कारणाभावः । १ । २ । २ ।

न पुनः पटादेरनुत्पत्तौ द्रव्यस्य तन्तूनां तत्संयोगानां वानुत्पत्तिः ।

उक्ता आनुषङ्गिकाः सामान्यादयस्त्रयः पदार्थाः । तत्र सामान्यं कथयति —

सामान्यं विशेष इति बुद्ध्यपेक्षम् । १ । २ । ३ ।

भिन्नेषु पिण्डेष्वनुवर्तमानां गौर्गौरिति बुद्धिमपेक्ष्य एभ्य एव च परम्परतो व्यावर्तमानामयमस्मादन्य इति तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षं सामान्यं व्यावृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षो विशेष इति ।

भावः सामान्यमेव । १ । २ । ४ ।

भावः सत्ता सामान्यमेव, त्रिष्वपि द्रव्यादिष्वनुवर्तमानत्वात्, न विशेषः ।

द्रव्यत्वं गुणत्वं कर्मत्वं च सामान्यानि विशेषाश्च । १ । २ । ५ ।

1.2.1 कार्याभावः] J¹ J² S₂ S₃ Jambū., कार्यभावः J¹ J² S₂ S₃, कार्याभावः S₂, 1.2.2 कारणाभावः] S₂, कारणोभावः J₁, 1.2.5 विशेषाश्च] J¹ J₁ S₂ Jambū., विशेषश्च S₂ S₃

1 कार्यकारणशब्दौ पूर्वमुक्तौ । तन्निरूपणार्थमाह] placed after 1.2.1 in all manuscripts and in Jambūvijaya's edition. The transposition was proposed by Nozawa (1993, 113a n. 55). 3 यस्याभावात्तन्त्वादेः] S₂, तस्य भावात्तन्त्वादेस् J₁, 3 कारणस्य तत्संयोगानां] S₂, कारणस्यात्संयोगानां J₁, 4 न] S₂, om. S₃, 4 विनाशे वा विनश्यति] S₂, विनाशे वा विनश्यति J₁, 7 आनुषङ्गिकाः] S₂, अनुषङ्गिकाः J₁, 7 सामान्यादयस्त्रयः] J₁ Jambū., सामान्यादयः S₂, 9 अनुवर्तमानां] J₁ Jambū., अनुवर्तमानानां S₂, 9 बुद्धिम्] S₂, बुद्ध्यन् J¹, 10 व्यावर्तमानामयमस्मादन्य] conj. Jambū., व्यावर्तमानानामयमस्मादन्य J₁ S₂, व्यावर्तमानानां यदस्मादन्य S₃, व्यावर्तमानानामयदस्मादन्य S₂, 10 तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्षं] J₁ Jambū., तदनुवृत्तिबुद्ध्यपेक्ष S₂, 13 सत्ता] S₂, सङ्ग S₃, 13 त्रिष्वपि] S₂, त्रिष्वपि S₃.

क्षित्यादिषु यतो द्रव्यं द्रव्यमित्यनुवृत्तिबुद्धी रूपादिषु च गुणो गुण इत्युत्क्षे-
पणादिषु कर्म कर्मेति तानि द्रव्यत्वगुणत्वकर्मत्वानि सामान्यानि परस्परतश्च
व्यावृत्तेर्विशेषाः ।

अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो विशेषेभ्यः । १।२।६।

नित्यद्रव्येषु परमाण्वाकाशादिषु समवायेन वर्तमानास्तुल्याकृतिगुणेष्वयमन्यो ५
ऽयमन्य इत्यत्यन्तव्यावृत्तिबुद्धिहेतवस्तद्वर्तिनां विशेषकत्वाद्विशेषाः । एवं वि-
शेषा व्याख्याताः ।

सत्ता तु—

सदिति यतो द्रव्यगुणकर्मसु । १।२।७।

भिन्नेषु द्रव्यादिषु त्रिषु यतो जायते सत्सदिति बुद्धिः सा सत्ता ।

10

आश्रयविनाशादस्या विनाश इति चेत्—न, यतः—

द्रव्यगुणकर्मभ्यो ऽर्थान्तरं सत्ता । १।२।८।

यस्माद्द्रव्यादिभ्यो व्यतिरिक्ता सत्ता तस्मान्न द्रव्यादिविनाशे सत्ता विनश्यतीति ।

द्रव्यादिव्यतिरेके युक्तिः—

एकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यम् । १।२।९।

15

द्रव्यमद्रव्यं परमाण्वाकाशादि कारणद्रव्याभावात्, अनेकद्रव्यं वा घटादि सम-

1.2.6 अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो] J₁¹°S₁S₂Jambū., अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो J₁¹°°S₁, अन्यत्रान्त्येभ्यो J₁¹°, अन्य-
त्रान्त्येभ्यो J₁¹° 1.2.7 यतो] J₁¹J₁Jambū., om. S 1.2.9 एकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यम्] Σ, न
द्रव्यमेकद्रव्यवत्त्वात् J₁¹

1 द्रव्यं] Σ. om. S₂ 1 °नुवृत्तिबुद्धी] Σ, °नुवृत्तिबुद्धी J₁ 2 कर्म] Σ, कर्मे S₂° 2 °कर्म-
त्वानि] J₁S₂Jambū., °कर्मकत्वानि S₁S₂ 3 व्यावृत्तेर्विशेषाः] em. Jambū., व्यावृत्तेर्विशेषः
J₁, व्यावृत्तेश्च विशेषः S₁S₂, व्यावृत्तेश्च विशेषः S₂ 6 इत्यत्यन्त°] Σ, इत्यन्त° S₂
6 तद्वर्तिनां] S₁Jambū., तद्वर्तितां J₁¹°, तद्वर्तितां J₁¹° 6 विशेषाः] J₁Jambū., विशेषः S₂
8 सत्ता] Σ. सत्ता S₁ 10 यतो] Σ, यतो S₁ 10 जायते] J₁S₁S₂Jambū., जायते S₂°,
जायते S₂° 10 सत्सदिति] J₁Jambū., ययात्सदिति S₁, यत्सदिति S₂, यया तत्सदिति S₂
11 आश्रयविनाशाद्] Σ, आश्रयविनास्याद् J₁¹° 11 विनाश] Σ, विनाश S₂ 11 यतः] Σ.
यतः J₁ 13 °विनाशे] Σ, °नाशे S₂ 13 विनश्यतीति] Σ. न विनश्यति। इति
S₂ 14 °व्यतिरेके] J₁Jambū., °व्यतिरेको S₂ 16 द्रव्यमद्रव्यं परमाण्वाकाशादि] conj.,
परमाण्वाकाशादि द्रव्यं सद्रव्यमद्रव्यं S₁S₂°S₂, परमाण्वाकाशादि द्रव्यं यदि सद्रव्यमद्रव्यं S₂°,
परमाण्वाकाशादिद्रव्यम् अद्रव्यं J₁Jambū. 16 वा] J₁Jambū., यदि S₂

वायिकारणद्रव्ययुक्तत्वात् । सत्ता पुनः प्रत्येकं परिसमाप्त्या वर्तमानैकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न
द्रव्यम् ।

गुणकर्मसु च भावान्न कर्म न गुणः । १।२।१०।

गुणानां गुणेष्ववृत्तेः । कर्मसु च कर्मणाम् । गुणेषु कर्मसु च सत्ताया वर्तमानत्वान्न
गुणकर्मणी सत्ता ।

सामान्यविशेषाभावाच्च । १।२।११।

यदि सत्ता द्रव्यादीनामन्यतमा स्यादेवं द्रव्यादिष्विव सत्तायामपि द्रव्यत्वादयः
सामान्यविशेषा वर्तेरन् । न चैवम् । तस्मान्न सत्ता द्रव्यगुणकर्माणि ।

एकद्रव्यवत्त्वेन द्रव्यत्वमुक्तम् । १।२।१२।

यथा प्रतिद्रव्यं साकल्येन वर्तमानत्वान्न द्रव्यं सत्ता तथैकद्रव्यवत्त्वान्न द्रव्यं द्रव्य-
त्वम् ।

सामान्यविशेषाभावेन च । १।२।१३।

द्रव्यादिष्विव द्रव्यत्वादीनां मध्यात्कञ्चित्सामान्यविशेषो द्रव्यत्वे वर्तेत यदि द्रव्यं
गुणः कर्म वा स्यात् । तस्मान्न द्रव्यादीनि द्रव्यत्वम् ।

गुणे भावान्गुणत्वमुक्तम् । १।२।१४।

गुणेषु गुणानामवृत्तेर्गुणत्वं च गुणेषु वर्तते तस्मान्न गुणः ।

1.2.10 गुणकर्मसु] ङ, कर्मसु J^१ 1.2.10 कर्म न] ङ, कर्मण J^१ 1.2.12 द्रव्यत्वमुक्तम्]
J^१J, Jambū., द्रव्यवदुक्तम् ङ 1.2.14 गुणे भावाद्] ङJambū., गुणाभावाद् J^१J.

1 समवायिकारणं] J, ङ, Jambū., समवायिकारणं ङ, ङ, 1 प्रत्येकं] J, Jambū., प्रत्येकं ङ
1 द्रव्यवत्त्वान्न] ङ, द्रव्यवत्त्वान्न ङ, 2 द्रव्यम्] J, ङ, Jambū., द्रव्यं ङ, ङ, 4 गुणेष्ववृत्तेः]
ङ, ङ, Jambū., गुणेष्ववृत्तेः J, गुणेष्ववृत्तेः ङ, 4 च] ङ, om. J, 4 गुणेषु कर्मसु] ङ,
गुणेष्वकर्मसु ङ, 7 अन्यतमा] J, ङ, Jambū., अन्यतमं ङ, अन्यतमः ङ, 7 द्रव्यादिष्विव]
ङ, द्रव्यादिष्विव ङ, 7 द्रव्यत्वादयः] ङ, ङ, Jambū., द्रव्यादयः ङ, सत्त्वत्वादयम् J, ङ
चैवम्] J, Jambū., om. ङ 10 द्रव्यं] J, Jambū., द्रव्यं ङ 10 सत्ता तथैकं] ङ, ङ, Jambū.,
सत्तातथैकं ङ, सत्तातथैकं J, 13 द्रव्यादिष्विव] ङ, द्रव्यादि द्रव्यादिष्विव J, 13 वर्तेत]
J, ङ, Jambū., वर्तते ङ, ङ, 13 यदि] ङ, यदि [द्रव्यत्वं] Jambū. (conj.) 14 वा स्यात्]
तस्मान्न] ङ, स्यात् ङ, 16 गुणानामवृत्तेर्] J, Jambū., गुणानामवृत्तेर् ङ

5

॥ प्रथमोऽध्यायः ॥

5 चावृत्तेन] em. Jambū.. चावृत्ते J₁, चावृत्तेन Ś₁Ś₂, चावृत्तेन Ś₂ 5 कर्म कर्मत्वम्]
J₁Ś₂Jambū.. कर्मकत्वम् Ś₁, कर्मत्वं Ś₂ 10 अभेदः] J₁Jambū.. भावः Ś 10 लिङ्गते]
८. लिङ्गते Ś₂ 11 प्रत्ययेन] ८, प्रत्ययेन Ś₂ 12 प्रत्ययस्याभावाद्] J₁Jambū.. प्रत्ययस्य
चाभावाद् Ś

द्वितीयस्याध्यायस्य प्रथममाहिकम् ।

एवं द्रव्यादीनां नानात्वे सिद्धे पृथिव्यादीनां द्रव्यलक्षणाविशेषादेकत्वे प्राप्ते लक्षणभेदेन वैधर्म्यमाह —

रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शवती पृथिवी । २ । १ । १ ।

एते ऽस्या रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा विशेषगुणाः । अन्ये तु सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगवि-
भागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वनैमित्तिकद्रवत्वसंस्काराः । रूपं शुक्लादि । रसो मधुरादिः ।
गन्धः सुरभिरसुरभिश्च । स्पर्शो ऽस्या अनुष्णाशीतत्वे सति पाकजः । कार्यं
बाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं च ।

रूपरसस्पर्शवत्य आपो द्रवाः स्निग्धाश्च । २ । १ । २ ।

शुक्लमधुरशीता एव रूपरसस्पर्शाः । द्रवा इति सांसिद्धिकं द्रवत्वम् । स्निग्धा
इत्यासामेव स्नेहः । सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वगुरुत्वसंस्का-
राश्च । कार्यं पूर्ववत् ।

तेजो रूपस्पर्शवत् । २ । १ । ३ ।

रूपं भास्वरं शुक्लं च । स्पर्श उष्ण एव । सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगविभागपरत्वा-
परत्वनैमित्तिकद्रवत्वसंस्काराश्च । कार्यं पूर्ववत् ।

वायुः स्पर्शवान् । २ । १ । ४ ।

2.1.2 °स्पर्शवत्य आपो] J¹₁² J₁ Jambū.. °स्पर्शवत्यापो J¹₁², °स्पर्शवत्या आपो ऽ 2.1.2 द्र-
वाः] ऽ. द्रवा J¹₁ 2.1.3 तेजो रूपस्पर्शवत्] J¹₁ J₁ Jambū.. om. ऽ

1 नानात्वे] ऽ. नानत्वे ऽ. 1 द्रव्यलक्षणाविशेषाद्] ऽ. द्रव्यलक्षणा(भा)विशेषाद् ऽ. 1-2 प्राप्ते
लक्षणभेदेन] J₁ ऽ. Jambū.. प्रातलक्षणभेदेन ऽ. प्रातलक्षणभेदेन ऽ. 5 °द्रवत्व°] J₁ Jambū..
°द्रवत्व° ऽ. 5 मधुरादिः] ऽ. मधुरादि ऽ. 6 गन्धः] ऽ. गन्ध J¹₁ 6 स्पर्शो ऽस्याः
ऽ. स्पर्शस्या J₁ 6 सति] J₁ Jambū.. om. ऽ. 7 बाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं] ऽ. बाह्यमाध्यात्मिकं
ऽ. 9 शुक्लमधुरशीता] ऽ. शुक्लमधुरशीता J₁ 9 सांसिद्धिकं द्रवत्वम्] J₁ Jambū.. सांसा-
धिकद्रवत्वम् ऽ. 9 स्निग्धा] J₁ ऽ. Jambū.. स्निग्ध ऽ. ऽ. 10 इत्यासामेव] ऽ. इत्यासामेव ऽ.
10 स्नेहः] J₁ ऽ. Jambū.. स्नेहाः ऽ. ऽ. 10 मङ्गलाः] ऽ. मङ्गलाः ऽ. 10 °परिमाण°] ऽ.
°परिमाण° ऽ. 13-14 रूपं ... पूर्ववत्] J₁ Jambū.. om. ऽ

अनुष्णाशीतो ऽपाकजः स्पर्शः। सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्व-
गुरुत्वसंस्काराश्च। कार्यं पूर्ववत्। भौमादिदेहा भूम्यादिलोकेषु।

त आकाशे न विद्यन्ते। २।१।५।

ते रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा न सन्त्याकाशे। तस्य गुणाः शब्दसङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयो-
गविभागाः।

5

सर्पिर्जतुमधूच्छिष्टानां पार्थिवानामग्निसंयोगाद्भवताद्विः सा-
मान्यम्। २।१।६।

मधूच्छिष्टं सिक्थकम्। सर्पिषो जतुनो मधूच्छिष्टस्य चाग्निसंयोगाद्भवता या
संजायते तदद्विः समानत्वं पृथिव्याः।

त्रपुसीसलोहरजतसुवर्णानां तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्भवताद्विः 10
सामान्यम्। २।१।७।

एषां च तैजसानां यदग्निसंयोगाद्भवत्वमुपजायते तदद्विः सामान्यं तेजसः।

विषाणी ककुद्मन्प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्त्रावानिति गोत्वे दृष्टं लि-
ङ्गम्। २।१।८।

2.1.5 त आकाशे] $J_1^s J_2^s \dot{S}$ Jambū., तत्प्रकाशे J_1^s , तात्प्राकाशे J_1^s , ता आकाशे J_1^s
2.1.6 °संयोगाद्भवता] $J_1 \dot{S}_2 \dot{S}_3$ Jambū., °संयोगाद्भवता J_1^s , °संयोगाद्भवता° \dot{S}_1 2.1.6 सा-
मान्यम्] $J_1^s J_2$ Jambū., सामान्य \dot{S} 2.1.7 त्रपुसीसा°] Σ , त्रपुसीसा° \dot{S}_2 2.1.7 °रजतसु-
वर्णानां] J_1 Jambū., °रजतसुवर्णानां च add. J_1^s , °रजतताम्रसुवर्णानां \dot{S} 2.1.7 °संयोगा-
द्भवताद्विः] \dot{S} , °संयोगाद्भवताद्विः $J_1 J_1^s$ 2.1.8 विषाणी] $J_1^s J_2 \dot{S}_2$ Jambū., विषाणीति $\dot{S}_2 \dot{S}_3$
2.1.8 प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्त्रावानिति गोत्वे] J_1 Jambū., वृषभः प्रान्तेवालधिः सास्त्रावान्तालचर्मणा
लक्ष्यत{°ते $\dot{S}_1^s \dot{S}_3$ } इति गोत्वं \dot{S} 2.1.8 °वालधिः] Σ , °वालधेः J_1

1 ऽपाकजः] J_1 Jambū., स्य पाकजः \dot{S} 1-2 सङ्ख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्व-
गुरुत्वसंस्काराश्च] $\dot{S}_1 \dot{S}_2$ Jambū., संख्यापरिमाणपृथक्कसंयोगविभागपरत्वापरत्वसंस्काराश्च J_1 ,
(संख्यापरि) \dot{S}_3 4 ते रूपरसगन्धस्पर्शा] \dot{S} Jambū., तेजपरगंधस्पर्शाः J_1 4 तस्य] J_1 Ja-
mbū., ते स्य \dot{S} 8 मधूच्छिष्टं] Σ , om. J_1 8 सिक्थकम्] em. Jambū., सिक्थ+कं+(=) J_1 ,
सिक्थकम् \dot{S} 8 °संयोगाद्भवता] Σ , °संयोगाद्भवता J_1 12 तैजसानां यदग्नि°] $J_1 \dot{S}_2$ Ja-
mbū., तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्भवताद्विः सामान्यं। एषां च तैजसानां यदग्नि° \dot{S}_1 (eyeskip),
तैजसानामग्निसंयोगाद्भवताद्विः सामान्यं॥ एषां च तैजसानां(नां \dot{S}_1^s)मग्नि° \dot{S}_3 eyeskip
12 तेजसः] J_1 Jambū., तैजसः \dot{S}

दृष्टान्तार्थं सूत्रम् । गोत्वमिति गोत्वावच्छिन्ना व्यक्तिः । विषाणं ककुदं मास्ना
चास्यास्तीति विषाणी ककुदान्सास्नावान् । प्रान्तशब्देन कटिभागः । वाला अ-
स्मिन्धीयन्त इति वालधिशब्देन पुच्छम् । प्रान्ते वालधिरस्येति प्रान्तेवालधिः ।
विषाण्यादिभिः शब्दैस्तद्वत्प्रतिपादकैरप्यर्थव्यापाराद्धर्मा एव व्यपदिश्यन्ते ।

यथाप्रत्यक्षायां गोव्यक्तौ कथंचिद्गृह्यमाणा विषाणादयो लिङ्गं दृष्टमनुमाप-
कास्तथा —

स्पर्शश्च । २।१।९।

स्पर्श उपलभ्यमानो निराश्रयस्यानुपपत्तेर्वायुमनुमापयति ।

न च दृष्टानां स्पर्श इत्यदृष्टलिङ्गो वायुः । २।१।१०।

यदि खल्वयं क्षित्यादिस्पर्शो ऽभविष्यद्गन्धरसरूपैः सहोपलभेमहि । न चैवम् ।
तस्मात्पृथिव्यादिव्यतिरिक्तस्य वायोर्लिङ्गम् ।

अद्रव्यवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यम् । २।१।११।

यः परमाणुस्वभावो वायुः स खल्वद्रव्यवत्त्वात्समवायिकारणरहितत्वाद्द्रव्यम् ।
द्रव्यं ह्यद्रव्यमनेकद्रव्यं च ।

क्रियावत्त्वानुणवत्त्वाच्च । २।१।१२।

2.1.9 स्पर्शश्च] Σ. स्पर्श(सु) J; 2.1.11 अद्रव्यवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यम्] J; Jambū.. अद्रव्यवत्त्वाद्द्रव्यं
J;.. अद्रव्यत्वाद्द्रव्यम् Ś; Ś;.. अत्र द्रव्यत्वाद्द्रव्यम् Ś;

1 दृष्टान्तार्थं] Σ. दृष्टार्थं Ś; 1 सूत्रम्] Σ. सूत्र Ś; 1 गोत्वमिति] conj.; गोत्व इति
J; Ś; गोत्वं इति J;?.. 'गोत्वे' इति Jambū. 1 गोत्वावच्छिन्ना] Σ. गोत्वाविच्छिन्ना J;
1 व्यक्तिः] J; Jambū.. जातिः Ś 3 धीयन्त] J; Ś; Jambū.. धीयते Ś; Ś; 3 पुच्छम्] Σ.
पुच्छः J; 3 प्रान्ते वालधिरस्येति प्रान्तेवालधिः] Σ. प्रान्ते वालधेरस्येति प्रान्ते(प्रान्त-
J;?)वालधेर् J; 4 विषाण्यादिभिः] J; Ś; Jambū.. विषाणादिभिः Ś; Ś; 4 'धे'व्यापाराद्धर्मा]
J; Jambū.. 'धे'(स्य)व्यापाराद्धर्मा Ś;.. 'धे'व्यापाराद्धर्मा Ś;.. 'धे'व्यापारा(or possibly 'ग')ध-
र्मा Ś; 6 'नुमापकास्तथा] J; Ś; Ś; Jambū.. 'नुमापकः तथा Ś;?.. 'नुमापकाः तथा Ś;
8 'नुपपत्तेर्'] Σ. 'नुपपत्ते' Ś; 8 वायुम्] Σ. वायम् Ś; 13 'स्वभावा'] Σ. 'व्याभावा'
J; 13 'खल्वद्रव्य'] J; Jambū.. 'खलु द्रव्य' Ś 13 'समवायिकारण'] J; Ś; Jambū.. 'सम-
वायिकारण' ('णा' Ś;?) Ś;.. 'समवायिकारण' Ś; 13 'रहितत्वाद्द्रव्यम्'] Σ. 'रहितत्वादव्य'
J;

क्रियावद्गुणवदिति द्रव्यलक्षणाद्यत्र क्रिया गुणाश्च समवेताः सो ऽपि महान्वायुर्द्रव्यम्।

अद्रव्यवत्त्वेन नित्यत्वमुक्तम्। २।१।१३।

परमाणुलक्षणस्य वायोरद्रव्यवत्त्वेन समवायिकारणरहितत्वेन नित्यत्वमुक्तम्।

वायोर्वायुसंमूर्च्छनं नानात्वे लिङ्गम्। २।१।१४।

तिर्यग्गामिनो वायोर्वायुसंमूर्च्छनेन वाय्वन्तरसंक्षेपेणोर्ध्वगमनं प्रवर्तते तत ऊर्ध्वगमनात्संक्षेपः संक्षेपाद्वायोरनेकत्वमनुमीयते।

ननु च—

वायुरिति सति सन्निकर्षे प्रत्यक्षाभावादृष्टं लिङ्गं न विद्यते। २।१।१५।

यथायं गौरिति गोश्चक्षुषा सन्निकर्षे सति प्रत्यक्षेण विषाणादीनि तद्योगितया दृष्टानि कदाचिल्लिङ्गं नैवं त्वचा वायोः सन्निकर्षे सत्ययं वायुरिति प्रत्यक्षेण तद्गुणतया स्पर्श उपलब्धो येनानुपलभ्यमानं कदाचिद्वायुमनुमापयेत्।

क्षित्यादिस्पर्शविलक्षणधर्मत्वादस्य स्पर्शस्य निराश्रयस्य चाभावाद्वायुराश्रय इति चेत्—

2.1.14 'संमूर्च्छनं' J₁, 'संमूर्च्छनं' J₁ 2.1.15 सति ... विद्यते] om. J₁ 2.1.15 सति] J₁Jambū., om. J₁ 2.1.15 'भावादृष्टं' J₁, 'भावादृष्टं' J₁ 2.1.15 दृष्टं लिङ्गं] J₁, दृष्टं लिङ्गं J₁ 2.1.15 न विद्यते] J₁, न विद्यते J₁;

1 क्रियावद्गुणवत् cf. VS 1.1.14

1 द्रव्यलक्षणाद्यत्र] J₁, द्रव्यलक्षणोद्यत्र J₁ 2 समवेताः सो ऽपि महान्वायुर्द्रव्यम्] J₁Jambū., समवेताश्चापि महान्वायुर्द्रव्यम् J₁ 4 परमाणु... नित्यत्वमुक्तम्] J₁, om. J₁ (eyeskip) 4 वायोर्] J₁Jambū., वायोर् J₁J₁ 4 समवायिकारणं] J₁J₁Jambū., समवायिकारणं J₁J₁ 4 'रहितत्वेन' J₁, 'रहितत्वेन' J₁ 6 प्रवर्तते] J₁Jambū., प्रवर्तते J₁ 7 संक्षेपाद्वायोः] J₁Jambū., संक्षेपाद्वायोः J₁J₁ 7 'रनेकत्वमनुमीयते' J₁, 'रनेकत्वमनुमीयते' J₁ 11 यथायं... गोश्चक्षुषा] J₁, om. J₁ 11 विषाणादीनि] J₁, विशेष{ 'षा' J₁ }णादीनि J₁ 11 तद्योगितया] J₁J₁Jambū., तद्योग्यतया J₁J₁ (या corrected but reading ac illegible. 12 कदाचिल्लिङ्गं] J₁, कदाचि(दृष्टानि)ल्लिङ्गं J₁ 12 नैवं] J₁, नैव J₁ 12 त्वचा] J₁, त्वरा J₁ 12 वायोः] J₁, वायोः J₁ 13 कदाचिद्वायुम्] J₁, कदाचिद्वायुम् J₁ 14 'विलक्षणधर्मत्वाद्' conj., 'विधर्मत्वाद् J₁Jambū., 'वि... धर्मत्वाद् J₁ (five dots in J₁) 14 निराश्रयस्य] J₁J₁Jambū., निराश्रयस्य J₁, निराश्रयस्य J₁ 14 चाभावाद्वायुर्] J₁, चाभावाद्वायुर् J₁ 15 चेत्] J₁, च J₁;

सामान्यतोदृष्टाच्चाविशेषः । २।१।१६।

आकाशादीनामपि परोक्षत्वात्तत्प्रतिषेधेन वायोरेवायं स्पर्श इत्ययं विशेष ए-
तस्मात्सामान्यतोदृष्टान्नावगम्यते । विभूनां स्पर्शवत्त्वे भावानां प्रतिघात इति
चेत्—एवं तर्हि वायोरेवायं भवत्प्रसिद्धस्य स्पर्शो न दशमस्य द्रव्यस्येति कथं
5 ज्ञायते ।

तस्मादागमिकम् । २।१।१७।

तस्माद्वायुरस्तीति वाक्यमागमिकं प्रवादमात्रमित्यर्थः ।
नैतत् ।

संज्ञाकर्म त्वस्मद्विशिष्टानां लिङ्गम् । २।१।१८।

10 अस्मदादीनां सकाशाद्यो भगवान्विज्ञानादिभिर्विशिष्टो महेश्वरस्तदीयं संज्ञाप्रणयनं
नवानामेव द्रव्याणां भावे लिङ्गं दशमस्य संज्ञानभिधानात् । तस्मान्नवैव द्रव्याणि ।
अतो वायोरेव स्पर्शः । अस्मद्विशिष्टानामिति पूजायां बहुवचनम् ।
स कथं ज्ञायत इत्युच्यते ।

प्रत्यक्षपूर्वकत्वात्संज्ञाकर्मणः । २।१।१९।

15 प्रत्यक्षेण हि पदार्थमालोचयन्तः संज्ञाः प्रणयन्ति दृष्टं च दारकस्य नामक-
रणे प्रणीताच्चेमाः खलु संज्ञास्तस्मान्मन्यामहे—अस्ति भगवानस्मद्विशिष्टो यो
ऽस्मदादिपरोक्षाणामपि भावानां प्रत्यक्षदर्शी येनेदं संज्ञादि प्रणीतमिति ।

2.1.16 °दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः] J¹Jambū., °दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः J₁, °दृष्टाच्चाविशेषः Ś, Ś₁, °दृष्टाच्चावि-
शेषः Ś₂ 2.1.17 तस्मादागमिकम्] J¹J₁Jambū., तस्मादागमिकम् Ś 2.1.18 संज्ञाकर्म-
त्वस्मद्विशिष्टानां] J¹J₁Jambū., संज्ञाकर्मत्वस्मद्विशिष्टानां Ś

2 परोक्षत्वात्तत्प्रतिषेधेन] Σ. परोक्षत्वात्तत्प्रतिषेधेन J₁ 2 वायोरेवायं] Σ. वायोरेवायं न्य
Ś¹ Ś₁ 3 एतस्मात्] Σ. एतस्मात् Ś₁ 3 °दृष्टान्नावगम्यते] J₁Jambū., °दृष्टान्नावगम्यते
Ś 3 भावानां प्रतिघात] ŚJambū., भावप्रतिघात J₁ 4 वायोरेवायं] J₁Ś₁, वायोरेवायं Ś₁
वायोरेवायं Ś₂ 4 द्रव्यस्येति] Σ. द्रव्यस्येति J₁ 7 वाक्यमागमिकं] J₁Jambū., वाक्यमागमिक
Ś 11 भावे लिङ्गं] Σ. भावलिङ्गं Ś₁ 11 तस्मान्नवैव] Σ. तस्मान्नवैव Ś₁ 12 अस्मद्विशि-
ष्टानाम्] Σ. अस्माद्विशिष्टानाम् J₁ 15 प्रणयन्ति] Σ. प्रणयन्ति J₁ 15 दारकस्य] Σ. दार-
कस्य Ś₁ 17 यो ऽस्मदादि°] J₁Jambū., यस्मादादि° Ś 17 °दर्शी येनेदं] Ś₁Jambū., येनेदं
°दर्शी येनेदं J₁°, °दर्शी येनेदं Ś₁, °दर्शनेनेदं Ś₁

निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनमित्याकाशस्य लिङ्गम् । २।१।२०।

यदेतन्निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनं च पुरुषस्य द्वारादिना भवति न भित्त्यादौ तदाकाशकृतमतो-
निष्क्रमणप्रवेशने आकाशस्य लिङ्गमिति । मूर्ताभावो ह्याकाशम् ।

तन्न ।

तदलिङ्गमेकद्रव्यवत्त्वात्कर्मणः । २।१।२१।

5

निष्क्रमणादि कर्म पुरुषे वर्तमानमेकद्रव्यं कर्मेत्युक्तत्वान्निष्क्रियत्वाच्चाकाशस्याका-
शावृत्ति कथं तद्गमयेदसम्बन्धात् ।

यथा लोष्टवृत्ति पतनं गुरुत्वस्य लिङ्गमेवं पुरुषवृत्ति निष्क्रमणमाकाशस्य
लिङ्गमिति चेत्—न—

कारणान्तरानुकूतिवैधर्म्याच्च । २।१।२२।

10

गुरुत्वं कर्मणो ऽसमवायिकारणमुक्तं तदनुमीयतां न त्वाकाशस्यासमवायिकार-
णत्वं युज्यते नित्यत्वद्रव्यत्वानाश्रितत्वैराकाशस्य गुरुत्वादिनासमवायिकारणेन
वैधर्म्यात् ।

यदुक्तं निष्क्रमणं चाकाशकृतत्वाद्वारादिनेत्येतन्न ।

संयोगादभावः कर्मणः । २।१।२३।

15

भित्त्यादिना स्पर्शवद्द्रव्येण शरीरादेः कर्माधारस्य संयोगान्निष्क्रमणं निवर्तते न
त्वाकाशाभावात् । तस्य सर्वगतत्वात्तत्रापि भावः । तस्माच्छब्दलिङ्गमेवाकाशम् ।

2.1.21 तदलिङ्गम्] Σ. तदलिङ्गम् J₁. 2.1.21 °कद्रव्यवत्त्वात्] J₁Jambū., °कद्रव्यवत्त्वा
J₁°. °कद्रव्यत्वात् Ś 2.1.22 °नुकूतिवैधर्म्याच्च] J₁J₁Jambū., °नुततस्यवैधर्म्या च Ś₁°,
°नु(तत्त्व्य)तिवैधर्म्या च Ś₁°, °नु(त्कूति)वैधर्म्याच्च Ś₂, °नुततिवैधर्म्याच्च Ś₃

1 प्रवेशनम्] J₁J₁Jambū., प्रवेशम् Ś 2 च] J₁Jambū., om. Ś 2 तदाकाश°] J₁Jambū.,
तदाकाशे Ś 2 °कृतमतो] Ś₁Ś₂Jambū., °कृतमतो J₁, °कृतसोर (or °सरो) Ś₃ 3 °प्रवेशने
आकाशस्य] J₁Jambū., °प्रवेशनाकाशस्य Ś 3 मूर्ताभावो] Σ, पूर्वाभावो J₁ 6 कर्म] Σ,
किर्म Ś₁° 6 वर्तमानमेकद्रव्यं] Σ, वर्तमानमेकद्रव्यं Ś₁° 7 निष्क्रियत्वाच्चाकाशस्याकाशावृत्ति]
Σ, निःक्रियत्वाच्चाकाशस्य आकाशावृत्ति J₁ 7 °सम्बन्धात्] J₁Ś₂Jambū., °सम्बन्धनात् Ś₁Ś₃
8 गुरुत्वस्य लिङ्गमेवं] J₁Jambū., गुरुत्वलिङ्गमेव Ś 11 त्वाकाशस्यासमवायि°] Σ, त्वा-
काशस्य । समवायि° J₁ 12 °नितित्वैराकाशस्य] J₁Jambū., नितित्वेना{°न Ś₁}काशस्य Ś
13 वैधर्म्यात्] J₁Jambū., वैधर्म्यम् Ś 14 निष्क्रमणं चाकाश°] J₁Jambū., निष्क्रमणमाका-
श° Ś 14 °कृतत्वाद्वारा°] Σ, °कृतत्वाद्वारा° J₁ 16 स्पर्शवद्द्रव्येण] Σ, स्पर्शवद्द्रव्येण
J₁

भेयादीनामेव निमित्तानां शब्दो गुण इति चेत्—न।

कारणगुणपूर्वः कार्ये गुणो दृष्टः कार्यान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च शब्दः
स्पर्शवतामगुणः। २।१।२४।

इह ये स्पर्शवतां विशेषगुणा एकैकेन्द्रियग्राह्यास्ते कारणगुणैः कार्ये निष्पाद्यन्ते।
5 न च भेर्यवयवेषु रूपादय इव कञ्चिच्छब्दभागः समवेत उपलभ्यते। तस्मादकार-
णगुणपूर्वत्वान्न भेयादेः स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुणः शब्दः। यच्च स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुणः
स कार्ये यावत्कार्यमुपलभ्यमानो दृष्टः। न चैवं शब्दस्ततो न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः।
किञ्च स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुण आरब्धे कार्ये कारणगुणैरारभ्यते न च यदा शब्देन शब्द
आरभ्यते तदा किञ्चित्कार्यमुत्पन्नं पश्यामः। तस्मात्कार्यान्तराप्रादुर्भावाच्च न
10 शब्दः स्पर्शवतो विशेषगुण इति।

परत्र समवायात्प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च नात्मगुणो न मनोगु-
णः। २।१।२५।

परत्र वहिरित्यर्थः। ये सत्त्वात्मगुणास्ते सुखादय इवान्तःशरीरमुपलभ्यन्ते। न
चैवं शब्दो वहिर्वहुभिरुपलभ्यमानत्वात्। न चात्मगुणो बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्यः। अयं
15 तु ओत्रप्रत्यक्षः, तस्मान्नात्मगुणः। अत एव वहिरुपलभ्यमानत्वाद्बाह्येन्द्रियप्र-
त्यक्षत्वाच्च न मनोगुणः। ओत्रप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न दिङ्मालयोः।

तस्माद्गुणः सन्—

2.1.24 कार्ये गुणो] J, Ś, Ś, Jambū., कार्यगुणी J, . कार्ये गुणो Ś. 2.1.24 दृष्टः] Σ. दृष्टिः
Ś. 2.1.25 परत्र समवायात्प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च] J, Jambū., परत्र प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च J, . परत्राप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च
Ś 2.1.25 नात्मगुणो] Σ. नात्मनो Ś. 2.1.25 मनोगुणः] J, Ś, Ś, Jambū., मनोगुणः J, .
मनोगुणः Ś.

1 भेयादीनामेव] Ś, Ś, Ś, Jambū., भेयादीनामेव J, . भेयादीनामिव Ś. 1 गुण इति] Ś, Ś, Ja-
mbū. (em.). गुणा इति J, . गुणदिति Ś. 4 एकैकेन्द्रियग्राह्याम्] J, Ś, Jambū., एकैकेन्द्रि-
याग्राह्याम् Ś, Ś. 4 ते कारणगुणैः] Σ. तेः कारणगुणैः J. 5 इवादय] Σ. नवयद Ś.
6 *कारणगुणपूर्वत्वान्] Σ. *कारणपूर्वत्वान् J. 7 दृष्टः] J, Jambū., दृष्टिः Ś 7 शब्दस्ततो
Σ. शब्दस्ततो(स्ततो) J. 7 न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणः] J, Ś, Ś, Ś, Jambū., न स्पर्शवद्विशेष-
Ś. न स्पर्शवद्विशेषगुणाः Ś. 8 *गुणैरारभ्यते] Σ. *गुणैरारभ्यते Ś. 9 *उत्पन्नं] Σ. *उ-
त्पन्नं(भ्यते) Ś. 13 सत्त्वात्मगुणास्ते] Σ. सत्त्वादत्मगुणास्ते J. 13 सुखादय] Σ. सुखादय Ś.
14 चैवं] J, Jambū., चैव Ś 14 *उपलभ्यमानत्वात्] Σ. *उपलभ्यमानत्वात् J. 14 चात्मगुणो
J, Jambū., चात्मगुण Ś 14-15 बाह्येन्द्रिय... तस्मान्] em. Jambū., बाह्येन्द्रिय-ग्राह्यः
अयं तु ओत्रप्रत्यक्षः+(प्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न मनोगुणः ओत्रप्रत्यक्षत्वाच्च न दिङ्मालयोः) तस्मान् J.
बाह्येन्द्रियग्राह्याः अयं तु ओत्रप्रत्यक्षस्तस्मान् Ś

लिङ्गमाकाशस्य । २।१।२६।

तस्मादुपलभ्यमानः शब्द आकाशं गमयति ।

द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे वायुना व्याख्याते । २।१।२७।

यथाद्रव्यवत्त्वात्परमाणुभूतो वायुर्द्रव्यं नित्यञ्च एवमाकाशं कारणद्रव्याभावाद्द्रव्यं नित्यं च ।

5

तत्त्वं भावेन । २।१।२८।

यथा सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भाव एवं शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैकमाकाशम् ।

॥ इति द्वितीयस्याद्यमाहिकम् ॥

2.1.27 द्रव्यत्वनित्यत्वे] J₁J₁Jambū.. द्रव्यनित्यत्वे Ś 2.1.27 व्याख्याते] Σ, व्याख्या(य)ते J₁

7 सल्लिङ्गाविशेषाद्विशेषलिङ्गाभावाच्चैको भावः cf. VS 1.2.18

4 वायुर्द्रव्यं] J₁Ś₃Jambū.. वायुर्द्रव्यं Ś₁Ś₂ 4 कारण°] Σ, कारण° Ś₃ 7 °भावाच्चैको] J₁Jambū.. °भावादेको Ś 7 शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद्] J₁Jambū.. शब्दलिङ्गाविशेषाद् Ś 8 °क-माकाशम्] em. Jambū.. °कमाकाशमिति Σ Col. इति द्वितीयस्याद्यम्] em. Jambū.. ॥ द्वितीयस्याद्यम् Σ

COMMENTARY

- 1.1.1 158.2. *kasyacid brāhmaṇasya vedābhyāsavaśena vyapagatakalmaṣasyedaṃ pratibabhau*. I follow the Śāradā manuscripts; Jambūvijaya reads with J₁ *vyapagatakalmaṣasyedaṃ vedavākyaṃ pratibabhau*. The question is to decide whether *vedavākyaṃ* has been omitted scribally in one tradition or has been inserted scribally in the other. There can be no clear-cut decision, but I find the word suspiciously over-explicit, especially in view of the preceding *vedābhyāsavaśena* and the *idaṃ vākyaṃ* that follows almost immediately.

158.2–3. *aśarīraṃ vāva santaṃ priyāpriye na sprśata iti*. This famous Chāndogyaopaniṣad line is probably the *śruti* passage most frequently quoted in Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya texts. Nozawa (111a, n.1)¹ notes its occurrence in the three oldest commentaries on the PDhS; it can also be found in other texts, even being quoted twice in Vādivāgīśvara's *Mānamanohara* (39.3 and 143.2–3).

158.3. *tata idaṃ vākyaṃ ālocya kaṇabhakṣam ājagāma*. Thus with J₁ and Jambūvijaya. The form *kaṇabhakṣaṇam* found in the Śāradā manuscripts seems to be unattested elsewhere. Perhaps it cannot be ruled out as a possibility though.

158.4. *bhagavann anena vākyaenāpahataśarīratvasya kṣemasāadhanatā kathiyate*. For *vākyaenāpahata*^o as in J₁, followed by Jambūvijaya, Ś₁ and Ś₂ have *vākyaena vyapahata*^o. It is on the whole probable that this is secondary, influenced by the earlier *vyapagatakalmaṣasya*; note that Ś₃ actually has *vākyaena vyapagata*^o, assimilating still further—it is of course unlikely that the latter reading was in *σ*.

The conjecture ^o*śarīratvasya* for the transmitted ^o*śarīrasya* has been dictated by considerations of sense and syntax. Without altering Jambūvijaya's text, i.e. reading *vākyaenāpahataśarīrasya*, Nozawa translates the sentence as follows: 'Adorable one! It is set forth in this passage that the removal of the body is the means to the final beatitude' (98a). Aside from the question whether 'final beatitude' is an appropriate rendering of *kṣema*, it is hardly possible that *apahataśarīra* can mean 'the removal of the body,' not does even an interpretation as a karmadhāraya seem at all plausible to me. But it is difficult to construe the transmitted text in such a way as to yield completely satisfactory sense: one would wish to take it to mean roughly 'this Vedic statement teaches that one who has freed himself from his body attains peace,' with *sādhana* in the sense of 'attaining,' but for this one would really require ^o*sādhanam* in place of ^o*sādhanatā*. This may not be an insuperable objection, but it seems on the whole a better solution to conjecture loss of a *iva* in the archetype:

¹ When no year is specified, all references to 'Nozawa' in this commentary are to Nozawa, 1997a, and give the pagenumber, column (a or b) and, where applicable, footnote number.

reading *anena vākyenāpahataśarīratvasya kṣemasāadhanatā kathyate* the syntax is regular and, a subsidiary advantage perhaps, *sādhana* may then be taken as 'means, instrument,' the only sense in which Candrānanda uses the word elsewhere.²

158.7–8. *atahśabdo 'pi vairāgyaprajñākaśāyaparipākādikāṃ śiṣyagūṇasampadāṃ hetutvenāpadiśati.*³ For °*kaśāyaparipākādīnām* Jambūvijaya prints °*kathāparipākādīnām*, with no variants reported in his apparatus. This reading is however only that of J₁ *post correctionem* and, consequently, of J₂. J₁'s reading *ante correctionem*, °*kathāyaparipākādīnām*, is almost certainly a result of misreading of Śāradā *ṣā* as the very similar *ihā*.⁴ The senseless °*kathāya*° was subsequently corrected, probably by a later hand, to °*kathā*°, by the cancellation of the *ya*. Considerations of sense confirm that this correction is a wrong one. I can adduce no parallel to *kathāparipāka* as a virtue of a student, and even find it rather difficult to say what precisely might be meant,⁵ whereas *kaśāyaparipāka* gives good sense, fitting well with the preceding items in the list (which is possibly a hierarchically ordered one), and though admittedly not a term which one immediately associates with Vaiśeṣika, it has close parallels in the Hindu tradition. I may in the first place point to a verse quoted from *smṛti*⁶ in Śaṅkara's *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad *Brahmasūtra* 3.4.26: *kaśāyapaktiḥ karmāṇi jñānaṃ tu paramā gatiḥ | kaśāye karmabhiḥ pakve tato jñānaṃ pravartate ||* (ed. J.L. Shastri, Delhi 1980, p. 802–803).⁷ It should also be noted that the term is semantically very close to *malaparipāka*, an important concept in (especially dualist) Śaiva metaphysics and soteriology, and one which it is very likely that Candrānanda was familiar with.⁸

2 The other occurrences of *sādhana* in Candrānanda's commentary are the *kāny asya sādhanāni* that follows almost immediately after our sentence here. *sādhanaṇy asyedānīm dravyagūṇakarmāṇi vakṣyāmaḥ* in the *avataṛaṇa* to 1.1.4 and *tasya* (scil. *dharmasya*) *vaidiko vidhiḥ sādhanam* in the *avataṛaṇa* to 6.1.1 (45.3).

3 I have discussed this passage briefly in Isaacson 1995, 761–763. Hara (1995, 210 and 221 n. 10) has pointed out a resemblance between this part of Candrānanda's commentary and a passage in Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on the *Pāśupatasūtra*.

4 For other indications that J₁ has been copied from an original in Śāradā script see p. 150 above.

5 Nozawa translates '... and also the word 'henthforth' [sic] indicates that the accomplishment of such necessary qualifications of a disciple as detachment, intelligence, ability to carry on discussion, etc., is the ground (based on which the sage imparts him the knowledge of the nature of *dharma*)' (98a); the rendering of *kathāparipāka* here may be the best that one can hit on, but still is a little uncomfortable and does not fit well in the passage in my opinion. Hara (1992, 221 n. 10) quotes the passage, giving the text as edited by Jambūvijaya, but offers no translation.

6 I am at present unaware of the source of the verse.

7 My attention was first drawn to this passage by a discussion in an unpublished dissertation by Roger Marcaurelle *Śaṅkara and Renunciation: A Reinterpretation*. PhD thesis McGill University 1993.

8 The fact that there was in many cases a close relation between Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika authors

Finally, the use of *api* here is worth noting as well. Nozawa's translation 'also' (98a) does not really make good sense. The function of the particle here seems weaker, marking the change of subject by its slight emphasis of *ataḥśabdaḥ*, and it is perhaps best left untranslated. Should one nonetheless wish to render it in some way, a phrase such as 'on the other hand' or 'for its part' might be used, or, less obtrusively, perhaps simply an initial 'And.'

- 1.1.2 159.2–3. *abhyudayo brahmādilokesu ceṣṭaśarīraprāptir anarthopamaś ca*. I adopt this reading of Ś rather than J₁'s °*lokeṣv iṣṭaśarīraprāptir*, for which Jambūvijaya has chosen, chiefly on the grounds that the double *ca* construction seems by a fraction the *lectio difficilior*. Nozawa: 'Prosperity means attainment of a desired body in the world of *Brahmā* and so on' (98b), omitting to translate *anarthopamaś ca*: 'and the cessation of [all] calamities.'

159.3–4. *niḥśreyasam apy ātmano vaiśeṣikaguṇābhāvarūpo mokṣaḥ*. This is the reading of all the Śāradā manuscripts, including Ś₁, although Jambūvijaya does not report this in his critical apparatus. J₁, followed by Jambūvijaya, has *adhyātmano* for *apy ātmano*, but this reading is clearly secondary. First of all, there is no reason that I can think of why Candrānanda should have used a word other than *ātman*: the only word for 'soul' which we find elsewhere in his commentary and the standard one in Vaiśeṣika works in general. Secondly, unlike *adhyātma* (neuter), the noun *adhyātman* is very poorly attested indeed, as far as I can see: the staff of the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles* has only been able to find two occurrences, both from the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* (7.12.27 and 7.12.29; cf. EDSHP s.v., p. 1785). Misreading of *py* as *dhy* is easy enough in Śāradā and other Northern scripts. The *api* serves the same function as in *ataḥśabdo 'pi* in the commentary on 1.1.1 (see above).

- 1.1.3 159.8. *tad iti hiraṇyagarbhaparāmarśaḥ | hiraṇyaṃ reto 'syeti kṛtvā bhagavān maheśvara evocyate*. This interpretation of the *tat* in the sūtra's *tadvacanāt* raises some interesting questions, which Nozawa has not commented on.⁹ That Candrānanda should take it as referring to God, and that God for him should be Maheśvara, i.e. Śiva, is not surprising, but what lies behind the introduction of Hiraṇyagarbha—why doesn't Candrānanda simply say that *tat* refers to God?¹⁰ Perhaps the answer

and certain Śaiva groups has long been known. As an illustration of the term *malaparipākā*, I quote a single passage from a Śaiva Siddhānta work: the commentary by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakānta (a Kashmiri) on the *Mokṣakārikā* of Sadyojyotiḥ: *nanv īśvaro 'pi katham na sarveṣāṃ puṣpa-pan mokṣahetuḥ, apekṣyābhāvat | na, malaparipākāpekṣyavāt, anyathā yathādṛṣṭānyamānu-
papatteḥ* (*Aṣṭaprakaraṇa* 259.14–15).

9 Nor has Chemparathy, in his article on Candrānanda's doctrines with regard to God (1970), said anything about them.

10 In the commentary on the reprise of 1.1.3 as 10.21 our commentator does do essentially

lies in some explanation of the sūtra which we no longer have access to but which was in Candrānanda's mind when he wrote this. Alternatively, it may simply be the case that Candrānanda was aware of and indeed accepted an older tradition according to which Hiranyagarbha is the author of the Vedas, but regarded this as an emanation or embodiment of Śiva,¹¹ rather than as an independent deity (whether or not identical with Brahmā). Such a view is indeed known from Śaiva sources which can be placed in Kashmir and at a period that may be close to Candrānanda's date; thus the great dualist theologian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the *Kiraṇāgama* introduces a *pūrvapakṣa* objecting on this ground to the position that the *āgamas* are the highest form of revelation because they were revealed by Śiva: *nanu vedādijñānāny evaṃ hariharahiranyagarbhādyātmakaprasiddhaśivakṛtāni parāṇi bhaviṣyanti*. Rāmakaṇṭha himself is not convinced by this view, rejecting the objection with the words *tad ayuktam, teṣāṃ aśivarūpamuktyupadeśakatvena śivakṛtāvāsiddheḥ*,¹² but it is likely that the opponents here are not merely imaginary ones. The same author, in his commentary on Sadyojyotis' *Mokṣakārikā*, also remarks *vedādīnāṃ api racanā kartāraṃ na vyabhicarati | hiranyagarbhaprabhṛtayaḥ kartāro 'bhiyuktaiḥ smaryante* (*Aṣṭaprakaraṇam* 276.4–5); here he adds no further comment. Presumably his objection is only to the identification of Hiranyagarbha and other presumed authors of the Vedas with Śiva—precisely the identification Candrānanda makes here.¹³ The particular bit of exegesis by which Candrānanda wishes to make plausible that Hiranyagarbha may be a name of (a manifestation of) Śiva utilises, it could be said, the fact that Hiranyaretas and Suvarṇaretas are somewhat better known names/epithets of Śiva.

A less important point to which attention may be drawn is that the Śāradā manuscripts all read *śrībhagavān* instead of *bhagavān*. Like Jambūvijaya, I follow J₁ here, regarding it as more likely that a scribe should add the additional honorific than that one should have omitted it (cf. also the similar case mentioned on p. 149 above).

159.16. *prthivītvābhisambandhāt prthivī | evaṃ abādisaṃjñāḥ*. Jambūvijaya's emendation *prthivītvābhisambandhāt* for the *prthivītvādisambandhāt* of Ś₁ and Ś₂ is obviously correct; as Nozawa points out (111b n. 6) the same words also occur in the PDhS (27.9). The other emendation, *abādisaṃjñāḥ* where the manuscripts

this, writing *tanubhuvanādikāryatayā vijñāto bhagavān īśvaraḥ, tatpraṇayanāc cāmṇāyasya siddham prāmāṇyam* (76.11).

11 On the notion of God's taking on a body to teach the Vedas, particularly as discussed in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, see p. 33f. above.

12 Mr. D. Goodall kindly made these passages available to me from his edition (in progress) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's *Kiraṇavṛtti*.

13 In the Vedic tradition itself Hiranyagarbha is given as the name of the author of a single hymn, *Rgveda* 10. 121: cf. Gonda 1975. 78.

have and Jambūvijaya prints *abādisaṃjñā*, is a very minimal one, as the following word is *navaiva*. This starts a new sentence, but the manuscripts are in any case all inconsistent in the application of sandhi. The plural is somewhat more natural, as of course more than one *saṃjñā* is intended, and one may also point to a parallel in Candrānanda's commentary on 6.1.3: *santi caitā brāhmaṇādīsaṃjñāḥ, tā yena pratyakṣam artham ālocya prañītā iti sūtrārthaṃ varṇayanti* (45.15–16).

1.1.5 160.6. *ete saptadaśa kaṇṭhoktā rūpādayo guṇāḥ*. Nozawa's rendering, 'These seventeen, color etc., enumerated one by one, are qualities' (98b), is incorrect: it is based on Monier-Williams' misleading lemma s.v. *kaṇṭhokta*. The word is correctly rendered by Frauwallner in his translation of the close parallel in the PDhS: 'Die ausdrücklich genannten Eigenschaften' (1992, 138).

1.1.6 160.12–14. *evaṃ saṃjñāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmaṃyavaidharmyaparijñānaṃ viśa-yadośadarśanadvāreṇa vairāgyotpattau satyāṃ niḥśreyase sādhye dharmahetuḥ*. The question addressed here is one fundamental to the Vaiśeṣika's claims to present a doctrine that is soteriologically relevant: how can the study of the categories of the Vaiśeṣika be said to contribute to the attainment of liberation (*niḥśreyasa*), which has in 1.1.2 been said to arise from *dharma*? On this point, as Nozawa remarks (111b n.9), Candrānanda's position and wording are obviously related to those of Praśastapāda, who writes in the PDhS *dravyaguṇakarmasāmānya-viśeṣasamavāyānāṃ saṃjñāṃ padārthānāṃ sādharmaṃyavaidharmyaparijñānaṃ niḥśreyasahetuḥ* (6.14–15).¹⁴ Of course in this sentence the intermediate role, so to speak, of *dharma* in the process is not referred to, but the difference may be chiefly due to the fact that Candrānanda felt he could not avoid referring to it (via the predicate *dharmahetuḥ*), in view of 1.1.2 which would still be fresh in any reader's mind. See also the closing sentence of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS (ad 10.21 *tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam iti*, a reprise of 1.1.3): *evaṃ dravyādīnāṃ sādharmaṃyavaidharmyaparijñānād vairāgyadvāreṇa jñānotpatter ātmā jñātavya-ityādivākyebhyaś copāsākrameṇa vijñānāvāptir niḥśreyasādhigamaḥ* (76.12–13).

The explicit mention of *vairāgya* in both these places, in ways that seem to stress its importance for the process of liberation, together with its inclusion as the first of the virtues of a student mentioned in the commentary on 1.1.1, suggests a difference in emphasis from Praśastapāda. It should be remembered that according to Praśastapāda's classical presentation of the categories *vairāgya* is a positive entity, not merely the absence of *rāga*; it is classified as a sub-type of the quality desire (*icchā*), being defined with the words *dośadarśanād viśayatyāgreccchā vairāgyam* (PDhS 261.13–14).¹⁵ This formulation was clearly in Candrānanda's

¹⁴ Cf. also the sūtra found (only) as Śaṅkara Miśra's 1.1.4, on which see p. 234 below.

¹⁵ For this reason 'detachment,' the term used by Nozawa to translate *vairāgya* (p. 98a, 134, 138)

mind when he wrote the words we have here. If Praśastapāda refers to *vairāgya* at all in his account of liberation, it is in a very indirect way; cf. *jñānapūrvakāi tu kṛtād asaṃkalpitaphalād viśuddhe kule jātasya duḥkhavigamopāyajijñāsor ācāryam upasaṃgamyotpannaṣaṭpadārthatattvajñānasyājñānanivṛttau viraktasya rāga-dveṣādyabhāvāt tajjayor dharmādharmayor anutpattau pūrvasaṃcitayoś copabhogān nirodhe saṃtoṣasukhaṃ śārīraparicchedaṃ cotpādya rāgādinivṛttau nivṛttilakṣaṇaḥ kevalo dharmāḥ paramārthadarśanaṃ sukhaṃ kṛtvā nivartate | tadā nirodhān nirbījasyātmanaḥ śārīrādinivṛttiḥ | punaḥ śārīrādanutpattau dagdhendhanānalavad upaśamo mokṣa iti* (PDhS 281.19–282.5).¹⁶ Here it may not be utterly impossible that Praśastapāda would have explained *viraktasya* as being equivalent to *vairāgyavataḥ*, but it is more plausible that it is instead to be understood purely negatively (as is *rāgādinivṛttau*).¹⁷ Thus Śrīdhara glosses *vicchinmarāga-dveṣasaṃskārasya* (NK² 631.17) and Vyomaśiva adds no comment. Of course the absence of *rāga* does not exclude the presence of the quality *vairāgya*, for like the latter the former too is only a sub-type of *icchā*, so there is nothing incompatible between the two accounts, but there is an appreciable difference in stress.¹⁸

160.14–16. *abhyudaye sādhye dharmaheturvaṃ punar amīṣāṃ same yajeteti prthivyāḥ | adho 'mbūni nayatītyādi yathāsvam anyeṣāṃ dravyānām | guṇānām tu kṛṣṇam ālabhetetyādi | karmaṇām tu vrthīn avahantītyādi.* With regard to (this-wordly) exaltation too, the question of the relevance of the Vaiśeṣika's categories may be asked. Since *abhyudaya* is to be attained chiefly through the *dharma* produced by Vedic ritual, Candrānanda illustrates the importance of Vaiśeṣika categoriology by some quotations which from the context one expects to be taken from the Vedic corpus, though he does not explicitly state that their origin lies

completely satisfactory choice.

16 On this passage see Frauwallner 1956, 236–237.

17 There is thus a certain redundancy in the repetition, which can perhaps be best explained (the commentators offer no help) by saying that Praśastapāda refers to the same phenomenon twice because it plays a part in two different ways. First of all the extirpation of *rāga*, *dveṣa* and so on is important in that it entails that fresh *dharma* and *adharma* are not produced (cf. VS 6.2.17: *icchā-dveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ*). But it is also important in itself, as leaving the soul devoid of specific qualities with the exception of the *nivṛttilakṣaṇa dharma* which itself passes away, after producing *paramārthadarśanaṃ sukha*.

18 The emphasis on *vairāgya* seems to form a genuine difference from other Vaiśeṣika authors as well. Vyomaśiva, for instance, who sketches the path to liberation in some detail, including discussions of opposing views on the topic, (Vyo² vol. 1 2.20–11.25), does not seem to mention it (though admittedly the text is not preserved quite complete here), only referring to the destruction of desire and so on, which as remarked above, is not the same as *vairāgya*. The mention of *upāsā* in Candrānanda's commentary on 10.21 should also be noted, as well as the distinction apparently made between *jñāna* and *vijñāna*. I reserve discussion for the commentary on that passage.

there. Rather interestingly, neither Jambūvijaya nor I have been able to trace any of them to such a source. Only one of them, *vrīhīn avahanti*, is a tag which is often quoted as if from a Vedic source, for instance in Mīmāṃsā texts.¹⁹ It is incidentally mistranslated by Nozawa 'They thresh rice' (99a); *avahanti* is of course a singular.

In the case of *adho 'mbūni nayati* the manuscripts all are clearly corrupt. Jambūvijaya's conjecture seems a very good one; it is close to J₁'s reading, correcting a single *akṣara*, *po*, to *dho*, the *akṣara* that the Śāradā manuscripts have at the corresponding place. It also yields appropriate sense—after an example referring to earth we expect one mentioning the next substance of the list.

An interesting and somewhat comparable passage may be found in Udayana's *Tātparyapariśuddhi*. There, commenting on a sentence in the *Tātparyatīkā* which runs *api ca dravyaguṇakarmanām abhimatānabhimatopāyatāprajñāpanena yathāyatham sarvā vidyāḥ prekṣāvataḥ pravartayanti nivartayanti vā* (NBh² 67.20–21). Udayana illustrates by means of quotations the relevance of the first three categories—the ones for which Candrānanda gives examples—not only in Vedic ritual but also in other areas of knowledge: *dravyasya yathā dadhñā juhoṭītyādi*, *guṇasya yathāruṇayā somaṃ krīṇātītyādi*, *karmaṇo yathā vrīhīn avahantītyādi* | *daṇḍanītyām api yathā dravyasya svāmāyetyādi*, *guṇasya yathā sāmabhedetyādi*, *karmaṇo yathā śāstraśikṣā gajavājivāhanam ityādi* | *vārtāyām api dravyasya yathā yathartu bījaṃ saṃgrhṇītyād ityādi*, *guṇasya yathā bhūmim plāvayec choṣayed ityādi*, *karmaṇo yathā sthānāntaram niniṣann anokāham abhimantrayed ityādi* (NBh² 147.22–148.14).

1.1.7 161.11. *paratvāparatvadvitvadvipṛthaktvapārimāṇḍalyādayo 'kāraṇam*. With a little hesitation I have accepted Jambūvijaya's emendation; the manuscripts point to °*pārimāṇḍalyādayo* as the archetypal reading. But I regard this as an error in the archetype; the form *pārimāṇḍalya* is one which I have been unable to find in other sources, and *pārimāṇḍalya* seems to be virtually unanimously transmitted in the manuscripts of the PDhS (where the word occurs at 18.12 and 130.24–25), including those which I have been able to consult which have their origin in Kashmir.²⁰ It also could be called the *lectio difficilior*, as the derivation of the form seems less straightforward than that of *pārimāṇḍalya* would be.

1.1.10 162.11. *evam kānicid dravyāṇy ārambhakāni kānicin naiva*. The Śāradā manuscripts add *ca* after *evam*; this reading is adopted by Jambūvijaya (who does not report that the particle is not in J₁). It is difficult to choose: the *ca* is peculiar here (Nozawa leaves it untranslated, with no comment), as the sentence starts a new paragraph, and one could therefore call it the *lectio difficilior*. Its omission in J₁ might be

19 E.g. the *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa*, where it is given as an example of a *nyāyamavāda* (244.24, §243). It is also found in quoted in e.g. the *Nyāyamahāṇi* (NM² vol. 1 670.11).

20 On the manuscript transmission of the PDhS see the preliminary remarks in appendix 3 below.

haplographical (*va* being of course similar to *ca* in Jaina Devanāgarī). But it could equally be a secondary addition in the Śāradā tradition, and it is this assumption for which I have chosen. In general, it is my impression that the addition of particles, with the aim of facilitating reading, is a very common element of scribal usage in India.²¹

162.15–16. *vināśo virodhaḥ, pratibandhaḥ kvacit | dravyādinā kāryeṇa kāraṇadra- 1.1.11*
vyam samavāyīyasamavāyīkāraṇābhyām ca na virudhyate. Jambūvijaya places a comma after *pratibandhaḥ* and has no punctuation after *kvacit*. Nozawa translates ‘Contradiction means destruction or obstruction. A substance as a cause is never contradicted by any effect substance, etc., nor is it contradicted either by its inherent cause or by its non-inherent cause’ (100a). It seems to me unacceptable to take the *kvacit* together with the *na*, which is so far separated from it in the sentence, as ‘never.’ If that is ruled out, however, Jambūvijaya’s punctuation of the sentence is difficult to retain, for as far as I can see it is not only ‘sometimes’ that a substance which produces another is not thereby destroyed—there are I believe no exceptions to this rule.²² For this reason I punctuate after *kvacit* instead, although the resulting word-order is a somewhat unnatural one; one expects rather *vināśo virodhaḥ* (or *virodho vināśaḥ*), *kvacit (tu) pratibandhaḥ*. Still, it seems possible, the word-order *pratibandhaḥ kvacit* indicating perhaps that the second definition has the nature of an afterthought. Incidentally, the word-order in Jambūvijaya’s and Nozawa’s analysis is also suspicious—at least I find the structure *definition | definiendum definition*² with no particles even more unnatural than the same with *kvacit* added as a restriction on the second definition.

Another possibility to be kept in mind is that the text may not have been transmitted correctly here, although the manuscript tradition is unanimous. The word *pratibandha* does not occur elsewhere in Candrānanda’s commentary. Could it have been inserted in the text from a marginal note?

163.5–8. *kāryakāraṇobhayānubhayair avirodhī virodhī ca | paramānūdvyānu- 1.1.12*
*kādīantyāvayavidravyeṣu rūpādayaḥ kāryobhayakāraṇair avirodhino yathāsam-
 bhavam | rūparasagandhasparśā akāryakāraṇabhūtā avirodhinaḥ paraspāreṇa |
 virodhina ādyamadhyāntyaśabdāḥ kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ.* Nozawa translates:

‘(A quality) is contradicted or not contradicted by both cause and effect or by either one of the two. Color, etc. in atoms and dyads etc. and substances in a state of the final whole are not contradicted by their

21 Thus in the transmission of the PDhS we frequently find passages where the manuscripts are divided, some having no particle and others differing in which particle(s) they add.

22 Of course it is precisely this consideration that has almost certainly led Nozawa to his interpretation, which I reject on syntactical grounds and not because of sense.

effects nor by the two kinds of cause (i.e. the inherent cause and the non-inherent cause) respectively. Color, taste, smell and touch, which do not stand in the relation of cause and effect with one another, are not mutually contradicted. Word/sound-s in the first, intermediary and last moments are contradicted by the effect and the two kinds of cause. . . (100a–b)

The initial compound, *kāryakāraṇobhayānubhayaiḥ* is not adequately rendered here; as the various examples show, it is to be taken as a dvandva with four members. Aside from this, there are problems with some of the examples here which Nozawa has not solved satisfactorily. To begin with the three kinds of sound: it seems most improbable that they are destroyed 'by the effect and the two kinds of cause'; this would imply that also the *samavāyikāraṇa* of sound(s), i.e. ether, is a cause of their destruction. Such a view is not to be found elsewhere, and is difficult to make sense of. What one expects is rather that each of the three kinds of sound should be destroyed in a different way, and I propose accordingly that *kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ* be taken as a triple dvandva with its members corresponding respectively (*yathāsamkhyā*) with *ādyamadhyāntyaśabdāḥ*. The initial sound is destroyed by its effect, the sound that follows it; the sounds in the middle by both the sound they produce and the sound that gave rise to them; the final sound by the sound that preceded it alone.

There is no other place in Candrānanda's commentary which allows us to confirm that this is his opinion on the destruction of the different types of sound: for comparative material we are therefore forced to look elsewhere.²³ In the PDhS we find, as might almost be expected, a statement which agrees closely with Candrānanda's commentary here. The initial sentence in the section on sound mentions the principal characteristics of this quality in Praśastapāda's typical nominal style as follows: *śabdo 'mbaraguṇaḥ śrotragrāhyaḥ kṣaṇikaḥ kāryakāraṇobhayavirodhī saṃyogavibhāgaśabdajaḥ pradeśavṛttiḥ samānāsamānajaṭīyakāraṇaḥ* (287.17–19). The difference in the order of words in the compound is doubtless to be explained as caused by the fact that unlike Praśastapāda Candrānanda wished the members to correspond respectively with the three types of sound: it confirms that Nozawa is wrong in taking *ubhayakāraṇa* in Candrānanda's compound as a karmadhāraya.²⁴

23 I am not aware of any survey in the secondary literature of the various theories of how sound is destroyed that we find in Vaiśeṣika texts.

24 It may be noted here, without digressing too far, that later Vaiśeṣikas, and indeed already Praśastapāda's commentators, do not unanimously agree on the theory which I attribute to Praśastapāda and Candrānanda. For instance, Vyomaśiva, in commenting on the compound *kāryakāraṇobhayavirodhī*, writes *ādyāḥ śabdāḥ kāryeṇa virudhyate, antyās tu kāraṇam virudhatu*

The interpretation we have arrived at of *kāryobhayakāraṇaiḥ* here requires us, I think, also to reject Nozawa's interpretation of *paramānūdvyāṇukādyantyāvayavi-dravyeṣu rūpādayaḥ kāryobhayakāraṇair avirodhino yathāsambhavam*. Here too we should rather take the compound as a triple dvandva and apply the *yathāsaṃkhyā* principle; colour and so on, as far as they occur/are relevant,²⁵ are in atoms not destroyed by their effects (one cannot say that they are not destroyed by their causes, for they are eternal²⁶ and have no causes), in dyads and other intermediate substances they are destroyed neither by their effects (the corresponding colour and so on that they produce in substances built out of the dyads and so on) nor their causes, and in final wholes, substances that do not produce yet further ones, they have no effects and are not destroyed by their causes.

163.9. *jñānaṃ saṃskārasantānapratipakṣaiḥ*. Nozawa 'knowledge is contradicted by counteracting factors to the continuance of latent impulse' (100b). This seems an unlikely interpretation to me. The factors mentioned in the PDhS and other Vaiśeṣika texts as destroying cognitions do not include 'counteracting factors' to the succession of mental traces (indeed I have not seen any reference to such factors). Instead the mental traces themselves are in some contexts mentioned as causing the destruction of cognitions; see, for instance, from the complex discussion of numbers in the PDhS, *tadanantaraṃ dravyajñānād*²⁷ *dvitvaguṇabuddher vināśaḥ, dravyabuddher api saṃskārāt* (111.22–112.1). The sentence should therefore rather be understood as saying that cognition is destroyed by mental traces and/or factors opposed to the stream of cognitions, i.e. which cut it off. An instance of the latter would be liberation, or correct knowledge which cuts off a particular succession of false cognitions.²⁸

madhyagatāstu kāryeṇa virudhyante kāraṇaṃ ca virundhanīti (Vyo² vol. 2 241.26–28). This is a clear distortion of Praśastapāda's intention: it amounts to saying that the first and all intermediate sounds are all destroyed by their effects alone. How the final sound is destroyed is not made clear, but apparently not by its predecessor. Śrīdhara on the other hand is faithful to the original sense: *ādyaḥ śabdaḥ svakāryeṇa virudhyate | antyaḥ svakāraṇenopāntyaśabdena virudhyate, anyasya vināśakāraṇasyābhāvāt | madhyavartinas tūbhayathā virudhyante* (NK² 637.13–15). Still other views are attested in later literature, but interesting though the point is, this would lead us too far from our topic.

- 25 This is closer in my opinion to the sense Candrānanda wishes to convey with *yathāsambhavam* than Nozawa's 'respectively.' *rūpādayaḥ* is of course a designation under which all qualities could fall, though it is probably the four first qualities that Candrānanda has in mind. Even those do not however all occur in each type of substance mentioned here.
- 26 With the exception of course of the qualities produced by 'cooking' in earth-atoms alone, and numbers higher than one which may be produced in them by the *apekṣābuddhi* of God or other extraordinary souls capable of perceiving them.
- 27 Note that this word is not unanimously transmitted, some editions (and manuscripts) having *dravyasāmānyād* instead (cf. Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994, 23 n. 17).
- 28 For the latter cf. e.g. Vyomaśīva's *yathā hi samyagjñānān mithyājñānasya santānocchedaḥ*,

- 1.1.18 165.9–10. *saṃyogānāṃ dravyam* (1.1.25) *ity agnisam̐yogād guṇāntaraprādurbhā-
vād* (cf. 7.1.5–6) *ity ātmasam̐yogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karma* (5.1.1)²⁹ *iti vākye-
bhyaḥ saṃyoga eva dravyaguṇakarmanāṃ samānaṃ kāraṇaṃ nānyo guṇaḥ*. It
should at least be noted that the citation of 7.1.5–6 is not exactly in the form in which
we seem to find those sūtras later at their proper place in the text, (*agnisam̐yogāc
ca* 7.1.5, *guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt* 7.1.6) and that there is but a single *iti* allotted to
the two; whether there are any conclusions that can or should be drawn from this I
do not know. Nozawa omits through oversight to translate the quotation of 5.1.1.
- 1.1.21 166.5–6. *tatra na tāvat karma svāśraye karmakāraṇam, niṣkriyadravyānupa-
labdhiprasaṅgāt*. None of the manuscripts transmits the *na*, but a negation is
clearly required. Jambūvijaya supplies a *na* (in square brackets) before *svāśraye*;
I have chosen to do so at what I feel is a slightly more natural place. There being
no very clear reason why the negation should have been lost, in either position,
one might also think of conjecturing *tan na* for *tatra*, which would at least have
the advantage that the error could be explained easily as confusion of similar
akṣaras; it could then very well have occurred independently in the two lines
of transmission. However I believe the partitive *tatra* is what is needed at the
beginning of this sentence, and find *tat* unnatural. If I am right, the omission of *na*
would appear to be archetypal.
- 1.1.27 167.8–9. *ādityaraśmīnām agurutvāt parvatasya tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāt
loṣṭasya ca hastenāsaṃyuktatvād anutkṣepaṇam iti gurutvādīnām utkṣepaṇam
samānaṃ kāryam*. For *parvatasya* the manuscript tradition unanimously reads
parvate, which is adopted by Jambūvijaya. It cannot be accepted, however: three
different reasons are given why an object cannot have the motion *utkṣepaṇa*, and
for each an example is given of a particular substance to which it may apply. All
three examples must be in the genitive case, which depends on *anutkṣepaṇam*. The
error is clearly archetypal—it is not likely to have occurred independently—and
results perhaps from a scribe failing to grasp the structure of the sentence and
substituting a locative because the genitive does not yield good sense if one allows
it to depend (as *genetivus subjectivus*) on the following *tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāt*
or because a locative was expected to express the object of the *prayatna*. Nozawa
translates the entire sentence as follows: ‘Throwing upwards does not occur in the
sun beams because they have no weight; nor in a mountain, because such things
have no volition; nor in a lump of clay, because it is not conjunct with a hand’
(102a); he does not comment on the locative. Leaving aside trivial matters, his
translation of *tathābhūtaprayatnābhāvāt* as ‘because such things have no volition’

naivaṃ mithyājñānāt samyagjñānasyeti (Vyo² vol. 1 3.3–4).

29 I have dissolved the vowel-sandhi with the following *iti* in the transliteration.

is clearly incorrect. None of the objects involved has volition, as that is of course a quality which souls alone can have. What is meant must be that such a volition or effort, i.e. the will to lift up a mountain and, by implication, the strength to do so,³⁰ does not occur, in ordinary mortals at least. This, not the absence of weight or of conjunction with the hand, is the reason why a mountain cannot be thrown upward.

167.12. *kāraṇasāmānye dravyakarmanām karmākāraṇam uktam* | 1.1.29. I deviate from Jambūvijaya by removing the *iti* that is found after this in all the manuscripts. This is probably a scribal addition, marking the end of the *āhnika*. The manuscripts are irregular in adding such *itis*; here they are admittedly unanimous but at the end of *āhnika* 2 of *adhyāya* 1, for instance, *J₁^s* (alone) does not have one. The only place at which Candrānanda clearly knew and accepted an *iti* in this position is at the end of the VS, in 10.21, on which sūtra he briefly remarks *itiśabdaḥ samāptyarthaḥ* (76.13); had he also regarded *itis* at the end of other sections as belonging to the text one would expect some comment there too, especially as in such places it is less obvious that the word is *samāptyarthaḥ* than it is at the very end of the entire work. I may note that it is an apparently quite common occurrence for an *iti* which one expects to belong to the colophon to be actually placed before the *daṇḍa* or double *daṇḍa* marking the end of the text; this phenomenon occurs even in manuscripts of works in verse, where metrical considerations make it obvious (presumably also to the scribe) that the word does not belong to the text proper. 1.1.29

168.1. *kāryakāraṇaśabdau pūrvam uktau | tannirūpaṇārtham āha*. In all the manuscripts this is placed after 1.2.1, and this order is retained by Jambūvijaya. As Nozawa points out (113a n. 58), however, it clearly has the nature of an *avataṛaṇa* for the sūtra, so I follow his proposal to transpose it to its natural place. An interesting case of an error shared by all the manuscripts, and one which may point to the fact that the sūtra text embedded in the commentary has not always been transmitted with it. Instead, at some point in the transmission pre-dating the archetype of all our manuscripts, the sūtras may have been added to the commentary, which could have had *praiṅkas* alone, for instance.³¹ 1.2.1

30 Note that strength is not mentioned separately, as far as I can see, as a necessary factor in 'throwing upwards,' neither in the sūtras, in Candrānanda's commentary nor in the PDhS. To some extent I suspect that it is subsumed under *prayama*, although that is a quality of the soul and not a physical one.

31 Cf. Srinivasan's remarks on the different ways in which the verses of the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* are transmitted in the manuscripts of the *Tattvakaumudī* (1967, 44–47). His observation that the manuscripts differ widely in the way the verses are quoted or incorporated applies to the tradition of several other texts I am familiar with as well, e.g. to that of Vallabhadeva's commentary on the *Raghuvamśa*.

1.2.3 168.7. *uktā ānuṣaṅgikāḥ sāmānyādayas trayaḥ padārthāḥ*. The Śāradā manuscripts omit *trayaḥ*, and it is not impossible that the word is a secondary addition. But it is equally possible that it has been lost in the hyparchetype of the Ś manuscripts, as a result perhaps of eyeskip between two *yas*. The matter cannot be settled; I have allowed myself to be influenced by the *ṣaṇṇām padārthānām* unanimously transmitted in the commentary on 1.1.6 and again ad 8.1 (62.4).

1.2.9 169.15–170.1. *ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 1.2.9 dravyam adravyam paramāṇvākāśādi kārāṇadravyābhāvāt, anekadravyam vā ghaṭādi samavāyikārāṇadravyayuktatvāt*. The sūtra aims at offering an argument to prove that the highest universal 'reality' (*sattā*) cannot be reckoned under the category substance. The two translations we have of this *āhnika* differ in their interpretation of the sūtra: Nozawa translates '(Beingness is) not a substance because of having one substance' (103a) and Halbfass 'It is not a substance, because it occurs in single (ultimate) substances' (1992, 240). In my view Nozawa comes appreciably closer to the intended sense here; if Halbfass' translation were correct the argument would be a very poor one. For there are substances, namely dyads (*dyānukas*), which 'occur in,' i.e. inhere in, ultimate substances, i.e. two atoms. So 'occurring in single (ultimate) substances' would, by the Vaiśeṣika's own presuppositions, not be a valid *hetu* by which one could infer that 'reality' is not a substance.

What is more, there are good reasons to think that Halbfass' understanding of *ekadravya* as 'single (ultimate) substance' is wrong. We have strong evidence that it was an axiom already in early Vaiśeṣika that substances can be of two kinds: *adravya* and *anekadravya*. The former group is that of substances which have no *samavāyikārāṇa*, i.e. the same as those which Halbfass takes as being referred to by the term *ekadravya*. The second comprises all compound substances: even the most basic of these, the dyads, inhere in more than a single substance. There are therefore no substances at all that inhere in (i.e. have as *samavāyikārāṇa*) exactly one substance. In other words, anything which does or can have a single substance as *samavāyikārāṇa* may on that ground be concluded not to be a substance: this is the argument that the sūtra in my opinion intends to express. All of these compounds—*adravya*, *anekadravya* and *ekadravya*—are to be taken as *bahuvrīhis*, not as *karmadhārayas*, as Halbfass evidently does with *ekadravya*.

As a first illustration of this, we may turn to the opening of Candrānanda's commentary on our sūtra. Here I have felt compelled to conjecture a reading not found in any of the manuscripts. For *dravyam adravyam paramāṇvākāśādi kārāṇadravyābhāvāt* Jambūvijaya prints *paramāṇvākāśādidravyam adravyam kārāṇadravyābhāvāt*; this is essentially the reading of J., though one feels inclined to divide *paramāṇvākāśādidravyam* into two words: *paramāṇvākāśādi dravyam*. Nozawa translates: 'Substances like atoms, space/ether and so on have

no substance, because there is no substance as their cause. (Substances in a state of effect like) a pot, etc. have many substances, because they are connected to the substances, i.e. their inherent cause' (103a), and Halbfass: 'A (single ultimate) substance, such as an atom or ether, is without (underlying) substance, because there is no substance that would be its (material) cause. And a (composite substance), for instance a pot, occurs in (i.e., consists of) more than one substance, because it is combined with those substances which are its inherential causes (*samavāyikāraṇa*)' (1992, 240–241). Neither scholar comments on the text, but both clearly have difficulties with it, Nozawa having for example no equivalent for the *vā* and Halbfass apparently rendering it with 'and.'

My emendation of the passage is based in part on Candrānanda's commentary on 2.2.27. The latter sūtra is identical in reading to 1.2.9; it is intended to argue, on the same grounds we have here, that sound is not a substance. Candrānanda writes: *ekasmin dravya ākāṣe vartamānatvān na dravyam ayaṃ śabdaḥ | dravyaṃ hy adra-
vyam paramāṇvādi, anekadravyam vā ghaṭādi*.³² It is precisely such an explanation, and structure, that we need here. I believe that *paramāṇvākāśādi* has been displaced in the archetype (perhaps via an omission that was corrected in the margin and then re-inserted at the wrong place), so that the *vā* no longer could be easily construed. As a result, perhaps, the text underwent further change in the line of transmission leading up to the hyparchetype of the Śāradā manuscripts, with among other things the *vā* being altered to *yadi*. The final product of this, the sentence *paramāṇvākāśādi dravyam sad dravyam adra-
vyam kāraṇadravyābhāvāt, anekadravyam yadi ghaṭādi samavāyikāraṇadravyayuktatvāt* (reading with Ś₂, as the *samavāyikāraṇadravyayuktatvāt* of Ś₁ and Ś₃ is clearly a further error), seems however to remain virtually incoherent.

The axiom that the sūtras and Candrānanda make use of is also found quoted as an authoritative Vaiśeṣika dictum in other texts. The Vyomavatī, to start with, explains that a compound earth substance does not exist in a single substance that produces it, using the following words: *tathādravyaṃ dravyam, anekadravyaṃ
ca dravyam iti vacanavyāghātaḥ | tathā hi—na vidyate janyaṃ janakaṃ ca dra-
vyam ity adra-
vyam | paramāṇvānāṃ janakaṃ nāsti | ākāśādīnāṃ janyaṃ nāpi ja-
nakam ity adra-
vyam nityadravyam iti yāvat | anekadravyaṃ tv anekadravyaṃ ja-
nakam asyety anena svarūpeṇa | dvividham eva dravyam, adra-
vyam nityam ane-
kadra-
vyam janyaṃ kāryam iti | ekadravyasya ca kāryadravyasyābhyupagame vyā-*

³² Also relevant is Candrānanda's commentary on 2.1.11, *adra-
vyavattvād dravyam*, which runs *yah paramāṇusvabhāvo vāyuḥ sa khalv adra-
vyavattvāt samavāyikāraṇarahitatvād dravyam |
dravyaṃ hy adra-
vyam anekadravyaṃ ca*. Note the use of *adra-
vyavattvāt*, where *adra-
vyatvāt* could convey the same sense. It seems intended to avoid any ambiguity on how to understand the compound *adra-
vyā*; cf. also p. 243 below, with reference to the readings of compounds of this type in the *sūtrapāṭha* found in the Ahmedabad manuscript.

hatam etad bhavatīti (Vyo² vol. 2 74.9–15). In some respects I find Vyomaśiva's comments here unnatural—on the oldest level I think *adravya* and so on was meant to refer merely to the *samavāyikāraṇa* (i.e. *janaka*) and not also the product (*janya*). But Vyomaśiva's understanding still is not radically different: the important thing is that substances can only fall into these two categories and that they correspond to eternal and compound, impermanent substances respectively.

The *Yūktidīpikā* provides another testimonium. In attempting to refute the Vaiśeṣika theory with regard to the compound whole (*avayavin*) being distinct from its parts, the author of this text maintains, *inter alia*, that if the whole exists in a single part, the Vaiśeṣika *sāstra*, by which a specific text could perhaps be meant, would be contradicted: *tataś ca yac chāstram dravyam anekadravyam adravyam vā tasya hāniḥ* (50.17–18). The context here thus resembles that of the Vyomaśiva reference. Similarly, in arguing against the existence of God, the *Yūktidīpikā* again tries to use the Vaiśeṣika's own principle against it: *tan na tāvad dravyādibhātah | kasmāt | dvividham hi dravyam anekadravyam adravyam ca | tatra nāneka-dravyam īśvaraḥ, kṛtakādidoṣaprasaṅgāt | nādravyam, parisamkhyānāt | pṛthivyā-dīni manahparyantāni navaiva dravyāṇīti vaḥ siddhāntah. itikaraṇasya parisamāptyarthatvāt* (72.24–26).³³

Other references to the same principle are not hard to find. I shall cite one final example, from Guṇaratnasūri's *Tarkarāhasyadīpikā*, a commentary on the Jain apologetical treatise *Śaḍdarśanasamuccaya* by Haribhadra. After a brief account of the substances according to the Vaiśeṣika, Guṇaratnasūri remarks: *idaṃ ca navavidham api dravyam sāmānyato dvedhā—adravyam dravyam anekadravyam ca dravyam | tatrādravyam ākāśakāladigātmanahparamāṇavaḥ kāraṇadravyānā-rabdhavāt | anekadravyam tu dvyaṇukādiskandhāḥ* (411.3–5 §469).

- 1.2.13 170.13–14. *dravyādiṣṭv iva dravyatvādīnām madhyāt kaścit sāmānyaviśeṣo dravya-tve varteta yadi dravyam guṇaḥ karma vā syāt | tasmān na dravyādīni dravyatvam*. Jambūvijaya conjecturally adds *dravyatvam* (in square brackets) after *yadi*. This is possible, and the word could of course easily have been lost either in the archetype or independently in both recensions due to eyeskip (homoeoarcton), but the conjecture is superfluous and the resulting construction almost over-explicit, as it is perfectly clear what the subject is. It is true that the commentary on 1.2.15 begins *yadi guṇatvam dravyam karma vā syāt*, but there the subject has not already occurred as it has here (admittedly not as a nominative): a fairer comparison would be with the commentary on 1.2.17: *dravyatvam guṇatvam vā karmatve syātām yadi dravyam guṇo vā syāt*, where Jambūvijaya does not make the parallel conjecture *yadi karmatvam dravyam guṇo vā syāt*. Of course in this latter case there would be no

33 Both of these *Yūktidīpikā* passages, together with a few more from the same text which bear upon Vaiśeṣika, are discussed in Motegi 1995.

plausible cause of mechanical omission.

170.16. *guṇeṣu guṇānām avṛtter guṇatvaṃ ca guṇeṣu vartate tasmān na guṇaḥ.* **1.2.14**
The construction is anacolouthic, but may be what Candrānanda wrote. I choose to let the sentence stand; the chief alternative would be to conjecturally read *guṇeṣu guṇānām avṛtter guṇatvasya ca guṇeṣu vṛtter na guṇo guṇatvam* (cf. the commentary on 1.2.16).

171.9. *sallīṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣaliṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ ||* **1.2.18.** As in 1.1.29, I **1.2.18**
regard the *iti* transmitted in all sources save J_1^S as not truly belonging to the sūtra (cf. p. 191 above).

172.6. *sparśo 'syā anuṣṇāśītave sati pākajaḥ.* The *sati* is not present in the Śāradā **2.1.1**
manuscripts, and one could reason that it is more likely to have been supplied than omitted. I have assumed however that this is not the case, and that Candrānanda is once again literally quoting the PDhS (27.17); as far as I am presently aware the *sati* is unanimously transmitted in Praśastapāda's work.

172.9. *śuklamadhuraśītā eva rūparasasparśāḥ.* Nozawa translates 'The colour is **2.1.2**
white. The taste is sweet. The touch is cool' (104a); he points out (113b n. 78) that the sentence is (again) lifted from the PDhS (35.24–36.1). The *eva* is significant enough that it should really have been translated; as is pointed out by the commentators on the PDhS it is to be understood with each equation. Thus Śrīdhara for instance remarks *śuklam eva rūpam apām, madhura eva rasaḥ, śīta eva sparśaḥ | apsu rūpāntarapratiṭīr āśrayarūpabhedāt* (NK² 109.8–9). The explicit limitation forms a marked contrast with the much more variegated qualities of earth, as taught by Candrānanda in the commentary on the preceding 2.1.1.

173.1. *anuṣṇāśīto 'pākajaḥ sparśaḥ.* Thus J_1 and Jambūvijaya; the Śāradā manu- **2.1.4**
scripts read *anuṣṇāśīto sya pākajaḥ sparśaḥ.* This cannot be correct, of course, but the reading that no doubt lies behind it, *anuṣṇāśīto 'syāpākajaḥ sparśaḥ*, is one which cannot be rejected out of hand. In its favour, so it could be argued, is the fact that the corresponding sentence in the PDhS runs *sparśo 'syānuṣṇāśītave sary apākajaḥ* (44.2–3). If we thus correct the Ś reading, therefore, the correspondence with the PDhS is slightly greater; note that a demonstrative pronoun in the genitive would be present in exactly the same two cases (the commentary ad 2.1.1 = earth and ad 2.1.4 = fire) as in the PDhS. If Candrānanda's sentence here had been closer in structure to that in the PDhS, with an absolute locative, I would certainly have succumbed to the temptation to emend in this way; as it is the balance may equally well be allowed to tip the other way.

173.6–7. *sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānām pāṛthivānām agnisamyogād dravatādbhiḥ* **2.1.6**

sāmānyam | 2.1.6. Nozawa renders: 'The fluidity of earthen (substances), such as clarified butter, lac and wax, (which is) due to the conjunction with fire, is similar to that of water' (104b).³⁴ As is born out, in my opinion, by some of the parallel passages which Nozawa himself quotes, it would be better to translate '... is a similarity [of earth] with water'; cf. for instance, from the section of the PDhS where similarities between various groups of substances are listed, *kṣititejasor naimittikadravarvayogaḥ* (25.24). The same observation holds for Nozawa's translation of the following sūtra: despite this, in the commentary to both sūtras he does translate *samānatvam*, clearly equivalent with *sāmānyam*, 'similarity.'

- 2.1.8 173.13–14. *viśānt kakudmān prāntevāladhiḥ sāsnāvān iti gotve drṣṭaṃ; lingam; vṛṣabhaḥ prāntevāladhiḥ sāsnāvān galacarmanā lakṣyata iti gotvaṃ drṣṭaṃ; lingam*. There is nothing in the commentary or in other recensions of the VS to support these additions and changes; the added words could perhaps have entered the text from marginal annotations.

174.1. *gotvam iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*. Clearly this sentence of the commentary is meant to explain the word *gotva*, which occurs in the sūtra in the locative. The manuscripts all seem to have *gotva iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*, which Jambūvijaya interprets and prints as '*gotve*' *iti gotvāvacchinnā vyaktiḥ*. But the lack of concord between the word in the *pratīka* and the gloss is, as far as I know, very abnormal; one expects either that both be in the nominative or both in the same case in which the word glossed occurs in the sūtra, i.e. the locative. No comment on this is made by Nozawa, who translates 'Being a cow (i.e. cowhood) means an individual cow defined by cowhood' (104b), in other words as if the lemma too were in the nominative. Wezler (1984, 459) also cites the text as printed by Jambūvijaya without comment. Nonetheless, I have decided to take the step presupposed by Nozawa's translation and conjecture *gotvam iti* for the transmitted *gotva iti*. The alteration is not a large one, especially if we bear in mind that the archetype (or an even earlier state of the text) may have written *gotvaṃ iti*: admittedly irregular sandhi, but not uncommon in manuscripts.³⁵ The *anusvāra* would then be at a high risk of being lost, both mechanically and due to a scribe's memory of the locative in the sūtra (the latter possibility is fainter in the Ś manuscripts, since they read *gotvaṃ*).

34 Roughly similar, though with slightly different infelicities, is Honda's translation of the sūtra: 'The fluidity of earthen clarified butter, lac and wax, through conjunction with fire, is same with that of water' (1990, 159(14)).

35 An instance may be found in the critical apparatus of Candrānanda's commentary on 1.1.1, where we find for the accepted and surely correct *dharma iti* the following distribution of readings in the Śāradā manuscripts: *dharma iti* Ś₂, *dharmam iti* Ś₁, *dharmam iti* Ś₃. It is probable that the hyparchetype had *dharmam iti*; this was faithfully retained in Ś₁, correctly amended in Ś₂ and 'normalized' in Ś₃ (leaving a wrong reading).

rather than *gotve* in the sūtra). In fact there are what might be traces of an erased *anusvāra* on the *tva* in J₁, though these could also be purely accidental blotches.

175.8. *nanu ca*. Perhaps it is worth noting that Candrānanda uses both *nanu* and *nanu ca* regularly to introduce an objection that is to be refuted thereafter (though the combination is of significantly less frequent occurrence),³⁶ in view of the fact that Wezler has expressed the opinion that the use of *nanu ca* in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* to introduce an objection 'might be an idiosyncrasy'.³⁷ I can detect no nuance in the choice for the one or the other. 2.1.15

175.11. *yathāyaṃ gaur iti goś cakṣuṣā sannikarṣe sati pratyakṣeṇa viśāṇādāmi tad Yogitayā drṣṭāni kadācid liṅgaṃ naivāṃ tvacā vāyoḥ sannikarṣe saty ayaṃ vāyur iti pratyakṣeṇa tadgunatayā sparśa upalabdho yenānupalabhyamānaṃ kadācid vāyur anumāpayet*. Nozawa's translation runs as follows.

When a cow and the eyes are in contact, horns, etc. are observed belonging to it together with the perception that this is a cow. These (horns etc.) become an inferential mark sometime or other. Unlike this, when the skin and wind are in contact, there is no perception of touch as its quality together with the perception that this is wind. How could this imperceptible wind be inferred from such a mark (as touch when it is not certain whether it belongs to the wind)? (105b)

Some of the infelicities here are perhaps to be put down to Japanese English and others to the attempt to translate somewhat freely. But aside from that, I find the translation of *pratyakṣeṇa* (twice) as 'together with the perception' unlikely; rather than a sociative. I think it is to be taken with *drṣṭāni* and *upalabdhaḥ* respectively.

175.14–15. *kṣitṛādīsparśavilakṣaṇadharmatvād asya sparśasya nirāśrayasya cābhāvād vāyur āśraya iti cet*. The reading °*vilakṣaṇadharmatvād asya* is a conjecture: J₁ reads °*vidharmatvād asya*, which is what Jambūvijaya prints. 2.1.16

³⁶ For what it is worth, I can offer the following collection (all references are to page and line number in Jambūvijaya's edition): *nanu* without *ca* occurs at 16.15, 18.1, 19.7, 19.8, 23.7, 31.6, 35.8, 49.15, 58.1, 58.8 and 60.13, while *nanu ca* occurs aside from the instance here also at 29.8, 30.1 and 60.1.

³⁷ To quote Wezler's remarks in more detail: apropos of the question of the authorship of the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* he writes 'interest will then have to be focussed primarily on expressions, phrases, etc., that do not directly belong to what may be called philosophical and technical terminology, e.g. the most frequent, almost continual introduction, in the *Vivaraṇa*, of an objection with *nanu ca*: now this might be an idiosyncrasy; and since it also belongs to those idiomatic elements which are philosophically irrelevant and are beyond the range of conscious control, it could contribute to prove the identity of the two authors assumed by Hacker if it were to occur with equal persistence at least in the earlier works of Śāṅkara the Advaitin' (1983b, 36).

Jambūvijaya fails however to report in his apparatus that his sole Śāradā manuscript indicates a damaged or lacunose original with four dashes after 'vī'; this is confirmed by the other Śāradā manuscripts. Aside from this, the word *vidharma* is in itself suspicious. Nozawa translates Jambūvijaya's text as follows: '(Reply) This touch is different from those of earth, etc. and cannot be without any substratum. Therefore wind is the substratum. (Thus the existence of wind is established)' (105b).³⁸ The sense 'different' attributed here to *vidharma* is indeed the one needed in the context, but if I am not mistaken it is not attested: *vidharma* seems only to be used elsewhere in the sense of 'wrong, contrary to *dharma*.' The word does not occur in the rest of Candrānanda's commentary. What is really wanted, therefore, is what I have conjectured, *vilakṣaṇa*, a common word regularly used by Candrānanda.³⁹ I feel that this has a high probability of being correct. One might only wonder perhaps whether Candrānanda wrote °*vilakṣaṇadharmavā*: or °*vilakṣaṇatvār*; the compound *vilakṣaṇadharmā* does not occur in the rest of the work. But it is quite natural, and seems to fit the context well enough, so I have decided to retain the *dharma* which is after all attested in all the witnesses.

Since the loss of the *akṣaras* °*lakṣaṇa*° is not likely to have occurred independently, I suspect that the archetype was damaged here. The hyparchetype of the Śāradā manuscripts, then, probably indicated the lacuna with dashes, and these were taken over by its three descendents, whereas J₁ or a lost intermediate manuscript omitted to mark the lacuna.

176.3–5. *vibhūnāṃ sparśavattve bhāvānāṃ pratighāta iti cet—evaṃ; tarhi vāyor evāyaṃ bhavatprasiddhasya sparśo na daśamasya dravyasyeti katham jñāyate.* The opponent has just suggested that the touch which the *siddhāntin* claims belongs to wind and allows us to infer the existence of wind could in fact belong to another imperceptible substance such as ether. Nozawa: '(Reply) It is denied that omnipresent substances (such as space/ether etc.) have touch. (Objection) How, then, is it known that this touch belongs only to the well-known substance, wind, and not to the tenth substance.' I would propose rather something like 'If [the *siddhāntin* objects to the *pūrvapakṣin* by urging:] if all-pervasive substances possess touch [they would always offer] resistance to [other] elements of existence [i.e. ordinary ones with form; therefore the touch that we feel without perceiving a substance cannot belong to them], [the *pūrvapakṣin* replies:] Then [if things are admitted to be] thus, [still] how does one know that this touch [can] belong only to the well-known [substance] wind, and not to a tenth substance?' If ether and so on

38 Apparently the '(Reply)' at the start of the sentence in translation is Nozawa's rendering of *et*, which here does indeed mark an objection by the Vaiśeṣika *siddhāntin* to the objection of the *pūrvapakṣin* which starts from the *nanu ca* introducing 2.1.15.

39 Found, besides this passage, at 16.8, 16.12, 35.10 (2x), 57.5, 72.16 and 72.19.

had touch, we would constantly feel resistance from them, as they are all-pervasive and thus constantly in conjunction with all existing things.

There is a textual choice to be made here too, though perhaps not one that affects the sense. For *bhāvānām pratighāta* (as in the Śāradā manuscripts, followed by Jambūvijaya) J₁ has *bhāvapratighāta*. Either reading could be original, but secondary compounding may be a little more likely, partly to avoid the ambiguity of two genitive plurals with different referents close to each other.⁴⁰

176.10–11. *asmadādīnām sakāśād yo bhagavān vijñānādibhir viśiṣṭo maheśvaras tadīyaṃ saṃjñāpranayanam navānām eva dravyāṇām bhāve liṅgaṃ daśamasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt | tasmān navaiva dravyāṇi.* Nozawa translates:

The name-giving of *Maheśvara* who is superior to us as regards wisdom, etc. is the mark for the inference that substances are only nine in number. The name of the tenth substance is not known. Accordingly, substances are nine only. (105b)

Again, ignoring minor matters, one must at least object to the rendering of *daśamasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt*, though the problem may be mainly a question of English. Rather 'because the name of a tenth [substance] has not been taught.' Nozawa does not refer to the parallel in the PDhS: *tatra dravyāṇi pṛthivyaptejovāyavākāśakāladig-ātmanāṇāṃ sāmānyaviśeṣasaṃjñāyoktāni navaiveti, tadvyatirekeṇānyasya saṃjñānabhidhānāt* (8.9–11).

179.7–8. *yathā sallīṅgāviśeṣād viśeṣalingābhāvāc caiko bhāva evaṃ śabdalingā- viśeṣād viśeṣalingā-bhāvāc caikam ākāśam.* The Śāradā manuscripts have *viśeṣalingābhāvād eko* instead of *viśeṣalingābhāvāc ca*. This is the *lectio difficilior*, and indeed there is no good reason why the *ca* should have been omitted. Nonetheless, like Jambūvijaya I suppose, I see equally no reason why Candrānanda should have omitted the word, and in 1.2.18, to which it is clear that our commentator refers, all witnesses testify to the presence of a *ca*.

I agree with Jambūvijaya in assuming that the *iti* at the end of the sentence in all the manuscripts is rather to be taken as belonging to the colophon, in spite of actually being written before the double *daṇḍa*; cf. also the remarks ad 1.1.29 on p. 191 above.

⁴⁰ Srinivasan, speaking of the same problem of deciding between compounded and un-compounded readings, expresses the opinion that 'Fälle, in denen sich sekundäre Flektierung motivieren ließe, etwa dahingehend daß durch die Flektierung das Gemeinte klarer würde, sind sehr selten. In vielen Fällen sicher, auf jeden Fall aber durchweg wahrscheinlich, ist in diesem Variantenbereich vielmehr nur, daß Überlieferer flektierte Formen zusammensetzten, und zwar nicht absichtlich, sondern unwillkürlich' (1967, 36 §1.4.5.10).

PART III

THE *sūtrapāṭha* MANUSCRIPTS OF THE VS

3.1 Introduction

The importance of studying manuscripts of the VS alone, i.e. without a commentary, has been justly emphasized by Wezler in his article on the definition of yoga in the VS (1982, see especially p. 645). The 'indispensable examination of all the MSS of the VS' which Wezler called for (op. cit. loc. cit.) remains however, and is likely to remain for some time yet, an unfulfilled desideratum, but efforts have been made to examine as many such manuscripts as could be found, and the more interesting results of this examination are presented in this part.¹

To the best of my knowledge, the only two scholars who have published information on manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS without a commentary are Gopinath Kaviraj and Anantalal Thakur.² In a brief article which was published as long ago as 1929, but which has been perhaps somewhat undeservedly neglected,³ Gopinath Kaviraj reports on 'an apparently very old manuscript (undated) of the Vaiśeṣika Sūtras,' from a private collection in Benares.⁴ Kaviraj noticed that the text of this manuscript contained 'several differences from the current text' (i.e. the text as commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra) and in his article gives, so he says, the differences. Regrettably, a complete transcript of this manuscript was never published,⁵ and its present whereabouts are not known to me—it is not unlikely that it will never be traced. We must therefore rely solely on Kaviraj's collation, the

- 1 Some of these results are published in preliminary form in Isaacson (1995 (especially sections I, II and III)). In case of any discrepancy between statements or proposals found there and those made here, the latter are to be taken as representing my revised opinions.
- 2 Their relevant publications are also referred to by Wezler in the article which was quoted above (see p. 643–644, note 3 on p. 674, and n. 8 on p. 675).
- 3 Thus Nozawa's useful *Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (1955), for instance, does not report the divergent readings Kaviraj quoted in this article.
- 4 Kaviraj 1929, 71. The name of the owner of the collection is not given because, as it appears, he wished to remain anonymous.
- 5 Kaviraj tells us that he was able to use the manuscript for a few days only (op. cit. loc. cit.).

completeness of which is uncertain at best. It is noteworthy that in several cases the reported text contains lacunae, and it seems therefore very likely that also in cases where Kaviraj found no clear difference from Śaṅkara Miśra's text to note, the manuscript may have been in fact damaged or illegible. When Kaviraj does not give a variant reading from the manuscript, therefore, we cannot always conclude that it read as does Śaṅkara Miśra.⁶

Anantalal Thakur is perhaps the scholar who has gone to the most trouble to examine manuscripts of the VS and its commentaries, as well as to exert himself laudably in the work of editing. The amount of concrete information on this subject that can be gained from his publications is, however, rather disappointing. According to an article with the title *Textual Problems of the Vaiśeṣikasūtras*, published in 1963, Thakur had at that time 'collated the sūtra-readings from six printed editions and sixteen Manuscripts preserved in different Manuscript Libraries.'⁷ Unfortunately, Thakur does not give details of the manuscripts he collated, not to speak of their readings. The sentence immediately following on the one quoted also has a confusing rather than an enlightening effect; Thakur says that '[a]mong them two have subsequently formed the basis of the editions of the *Vaiśeṣikadarśana* published by the Mithila Institute, Darbhanga and the Oriental Institute, Baroda.' The two editions referred to must of course be Thakur's own edition of the VS with the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary and Muni Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary, respectively (see parts 1 and 2 of this thesis). But since two manuscripts were used by Jambūvijaya and one by Thakur, these two editions are based on three rather than two manuscripts, as Thakur states here. Furthermore, it appears from this that the sixteen manuscripts mentioned include manuscripts of the VS together with commentaries, which leaves it unclear how many manuscripts containing only the *sūtrapāṭha* were in fact collated. Nor can it be excluded that the manuscripts Thakur referred to included some of the VS together with Śaṅkara Miśra's commentary.

Earlier, in the introduction to his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary on the VS, Thakur had stated that '[t]he known manuscripts of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras* are not numerous. They generally represent the Maithila version just mentioned.'⁸ Here too, Thakur unfortunately gives no information as to

6 I refrain here from an attempt to extract what information we can from Kaviraj's article and to evaluate the manuscript he quotes from, although this might be well worth the effort. Let me just remark that, from the rather limited information given, it seems that this recension, if it is a separate one, is closer to that followed by Śaṅkara Miśra than any other.

7 Thakur 1963a, 187.

8 This remark is found on p. 11 of the English introduction. The corresponding passage in the Sanskrit *bhūmikā* reads *upalabhyamānāḥ sūtramātrkāḥ tu prāyaśo maithilapāṭhānusārīṇyaḥ* (p. 24).

the exceptions which he implies exist, and once more the possibility cannot perhaps be excluded that Thakur had in mind manuscripts giving the text of the VS together with commentaries (for instance those of Candrānada—at the time known of but not published—and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) as well as manuscripts of the *sūtrapāṭha* alone.⁹ In short, Thakur's publications prove to give disappointingly little concrete information as to manuscripts which give a *sūtrapāṭha* alone and differ from the text followed by Śaṅkara Miśra. The hope need not yet be given up that Thakur one day will give us more details, or even publish the critical edition he had been planning, or else collations of all the manuscripts he has examined, but as the years pass, the chance of this happening becomes ever slimmer.

My examination of manuscripts containing the *sūtrapāṭha* without a commentary has confirmed Thakur's remark as to the prevalence of the version commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra,¹⁰ but two manuscripts I have been able to collate have proved interesting exceptions. Both contain texts which differ from the known recensions of the VS, as well as being mutually quite different. A brief report on these two versions may be found in Isaacson 1995, sections II and III). Here I present the full text of the VS as transmitted in these two manuscripts, providing a diplomatic edition and a tentative reconstruction of the presumed hyparchetype of both, followed by an attempt at evaluation. Clearly a diplomatic transcription was desired, since each is at present the only known transmitter of its particular VS recension, and without the aid of other witnesses and especially a commentary based on these particular versions a 'critical edition' is hardly a possibility. At the same time, both have numerous errors which can be identified as scribal, so that it is possible, and surely desirable, to correct the text to some extent. Presenting such a corrected and reconstructed text also offers the opportunity of adding numbering, a trivial point, but of considerable practical use when referring to these versions.

A few conventions have been used in the presentation of the diplomatic texts.

- () Indicate that a reading is probable but uncertain: this has reference to the condition of the manuscript and the clarity of the *akṣaras*, not to the wording of the text.

9 In another article we again find the statement that '[o]ld manuscripts of these sūtras are rare and those available generally follow the *Vaiśeṣikasūtrapāṭha* of Śaṅkaramiśra' (15th cent. A.D.) (Thakur 1963b, 78). But here too no details are given after this general statement.

10 I do not intend to give here a detailed account of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts containing the Śaṅkara Miśra recension, nor do I refer extensively to such manuscripts. Though the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Śaṅkara Miśra too has not yet been definitively established, I regard the available editions as being for the most part reliable. On one or two occasions alone, I cite the evidence of a Devanāgarī manuscript in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum, number 5346, and a Devanāgarī manuscript in the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, London, shelfmark α 301.

- { } Enclose syllables which were written by the scribe but later cancelled, whether by himself or by another hand.
- + + Enclose syllables which have been added either in the margin or between the lines. Note that cases where a correction was made in the course of copying by adding syllables in the main text itself, with an indication of where the added text was to be inserted, are treated differently; see the following item.
- × × Reproduce similar signs used by the scribe of the Ahmedabad manuscript to enclose syllables which he had first omitted and later added in the body of the text (i.e. not in the margins or between the lines).

Where a consonant was written with a *virāma* or a special *halanta* form,¹¹ a horizontal bar has been placed under the corresponding letter in the transcription. It was felt that such a convention was useful because the use of these forms, which of course often is accompanied by the non-application of sandhi, may in some cases be intended to serve as a kind of punctuation.

Word division has been added, but it should be remembered that the manuscripts have none, and that, especially where the text is corrupt, the decision where to divide may be difficult and partly arbitrary. No punctuation has been added, but the text has been formatted in paragraphs, one for each *āhnika* (or *adhyāya* where there is no subdivision into *āhnikas*). Finally, the transcriptions add between square brackets folio and line indications.

The reconstructions offered are on some points highly tentative, and should be treated as such. Broadly speaking, the aim was to identify and remove scribal errors with the help of other recensions of the VS and consideration of scribal usage and internal criteria, while preserving all such divergencies and idiosyncracies of which it seemed plausible that—even if they too may in some cases have arisen due to scribal error—they were once taken to be authoritative and commented on. The distinction can perhaps most easily be made clear by asking the reader to assume—as I in fact do—that both these *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, though themselves most probably copies of other manuscripts which contained no commentary,¹² ultimately go back to a version of the VS which was accompanied by a commentary, be it a written one or one which was only given orally. Such a text is likely to have suffered from corruption in transmission, as well as from deliberate change, but it must have been interpretable to the (hypothetical) commentator. It is this version which the reconstruction ideally aims at recovering, though it is a foregone conclusion that at many places this is virtually impossible;

11 The latter occur especially in the Trivandrum manuscript; see section 3.3.2 below.

12 For arguments on this point see p. 230ff. and p. 283ff. below.

for one thing, without the commentary it is impossible to tell to what lengths its author would have gone in explaining away difficulties which had resulted from errors of transmission.

Annotation has been added on some points where my decision in the reconstructions seemed to require comment. This has been felt to be the case particularly when a reading has been accepted which diverges from other versions. Minor corrections of simple errors, on the other hand, have generally been made without comment. Much of the discussion of readings and relationships with other versions of the text of the VS has been reserved for the sections analysing the variants and evaluating the recensions (3.2.5–6 and 3.3.5–6) and for the conclusion (3.4). Orthography has been standardized. On the sūtra and word level, added material has been placed in square brackets to alert the reader; on the *akṣara* level this has not been done. The diplomatic transcriptions should in any case allow the reader to identify all corrections without difficulty.

Compared with Parts I and II of this thesis, this part offers far less in the way of explanatory matter. This is due primarily to the very different nature of the material treated: alone, without the commentaries which presumably once accompanied these versions of the VS, it is in many, or perhaps even most, cases impossible to be sure of how the sūtras are to be interpreted. Consider, for example, that even when the commentaries that we do have are unanimous in their reading, the explanations given often differ widely. There is no way to be certain of how the exegetical traditions with which the versions presented here were once connected understood such sūtras. It is therefore very uncertain ground indeed that I attempt to tread here, and the preliminary and incomplete nature of the analyses, comparisons and evaluations made below must be emphasized. One limitation which has been imposed is that they only deal with cases in the text up to (Candrānanda's) 9.8; the practical consideration that lies behind this is that it is only up to this point that we have the testimony of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's readings and interpretations to compare with. For the later part we have instead the 'Senā Court' commentary, available from 9.1, i.e. overlapping only briefly with Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. The tenth *adhyāya* hereof being still unedited, comparison is a difficult task, especially as my consultation of the unique manuscript of the work has alerted me to the fact that Thakur's transcription of the *sūtrapāṭha* found therein (1965) is not always to be relied on.

Finally, it should be taken note of that all references to 'Nozawa' in this part without specification of a publication or page are to Nozawa's 'A Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra' (1985).

3.2 The Ahmedabad MS

3.2.1 Description of the manuscript

The manuscript now preserved in the collection of the L.D. Institute, Ahmedabad, which contains a text of the VS is a 'Sammelhandschrift' which I have been able to consult in prints (made from microfilm) generously placed at my disposal by Prof. A. Wezler. According to the library's card, which is included in the photocopies I have used, the manuscript is numbered 26307, consists of 18 folios but is incomplete, and measures 23.5×11 cm. The card describes the contents of the manuscript as *nyāyasūtrāṇi ādi aneka prakaraṇo* (sic).

The prints available to me do not cover the complete manuscript, which I have also not seen myself. I am therefore not able to give a full description here. The portion available to me consists of folios 1 to 7 recto. The first text given, covering f. 1r1–f. 4v12,¹ is that of the *Nyāyasūtra*, without a commentary. This is followed by the text of the VS, without a commentary, on f. 4v12–f. 7r8. The work that follows this, beginning on f. 7r8, is the famous Jaina treatise on logic, the *Nyāyāvatāra* of Siddhasena Divākara.² The text is bordered on the left and right by three vertical lines, of which the outermost is approximately³ 1.9 cm and the innermost approximately 2.2 cm from the edge of the paper. There are no similar horizontal lines above and below the body of the text, and the margins left at top and bottom vary between approximately 0.7 cm and 1.2 cm. There are 19 lines on each side. Each side has a roughly square area left blank in the center,⁴ measuring approximately 1.6×1.6 cm, created by the scribe's leaving a gap in the middle of lines 9–11. Lines 1–8 and 12–19 of each side usually have between 55 and 61 *akṣaras*; lines 9–11 usually have between 51 and 57.

That the codex originated in a Jaina community is confirmed by the use of typically Jaina *maṅgala* symbols such as the *bhale*⁵ and by the *namaḥ sarvvavide* at its beginning. The available portion contains no date, and it is unlikely that any is

1 It is somewhat exceptional that f. 1r is already used fully for the copying of the text: in most Northern manuscripts this is left blank or only has the title of the work(s) contained in the codex, or other similar information, written on it.

2 This is preceded by two *maṅgala* verses in which the deity venerated is the goddess of speech (... *jayamti bhāratīpādanakhacāṇḍramarīcayāḥ* f. 7r8. ... *tribhuvanajanāṇī pātu devī girāṇī vaḥ* f. 7r9). These verses are not found in the *Nyāyāvatāra* edition I have consulted (Upadhye 1971).

3 This approximation, and all subsequent ones, is based on a calculation which took into consideration the size of the manuscript as reported on the library's card and its size in the prints from microfilm which I used. The margin of error is unknown, since it is not certain how accurate the library's measurements are.

4 Cf. e.g. Tripathi 1975, 25–26.

5 Cf. e.g. Tripathi 1975, 39.

preserved; if there had been it ought to have been reported on the library's card, and the remark that the manuscript is incomplete can probably be safely taken as implying that the end, and therefore the final colophon, is wanting. I am loath to assign a date to the manuscript on palaeographic grounds alone; our knowledge of Indian palaeography (and codicology) is still far too rudimentary for that. I would hazard however that it is an old manuscript, that is to say that it is unlikely to be later than the early eighteenth century. It could equally well be one or two centuries earlier than that.

3.2.2 The script and the scribe

The script is Jaina Devanāgarī, with the medial *e* and *o* consistently written *pr̥ṣṭha-mātra*. As mentioned above, the *bhale* symbol is used, at the beginning of the manuscript. The only palaeographical point which seems worth noting is that the scribe writes *ḍa* in two ways: both the typically Jaina form and the regular Devanāgarī one being found.⁶ The hand is neat and regular. As punctuation the scribe uses both single and double *daṇḍas*.⁷ Colophons are preceded and followed by the usual *chaḥ*;⁸ in the final colophon of the second *adhyāya* of the VS, however, the symbol is written as a *ṣa* instead. The folios are numbered with numerals in the right bottom margin of the verso sides.

3.2.2.1 Scribal errors and corrections

Again it is possible to identify many readings as scribal errors, and most of them can be grouped into familiar categories (cf. p. 44f. above).

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). Several cases, the most significant of which occurs at f. 6r9, noticed and corrected by the scribe himself in the following line; see footnotes 19 and 20 below.⁹
2. Haplography. There are a few cases which may be classed thus, the most important of which is *aṇu* at f. 6r19, where sense, confirmed by the other recen-

6 The former at e.g. f. 6v1 (*parimaṇḍalaṃ*) and the latter at e.g. f. 1r1 (*ṣvamaṇḍa*) in NS 1.1.1. For the difference see Renou and Filliozat 1953, 694. In general, the script of our manuscript is very close indeed to the table of 'Nāgarī Jaina' in Renou and Filliozat 1953, 693–695.

7 The use of this punctuation does not always correspond to the text's natural divisions of sense. See the discussion on p. 230 below.

8 Cf. e.g. Bühler 1896, 85.

9 Here and in the following I do not give exhaustive lists of occurrences of a particular phenomenon.

sions, requires the word twice, once as the last word of 7.1.17 and once as the first of 7.1.18. *panaṃ* for *patanaṃ* at f. 5v19 is probably also to be explained thus, and so is *samavāyaḥ* for *sa samavāyaḥ* at f. 6v9, if I am correct in supposing that the latter error was not already present in the hyparchetype.

3. Dittography. Not very frequent in our manuscript, and apparently only occurring on the *akṣara* level. Example: *ititi* for *iti* at f. 5r7.
4. Metathesis. Metathesis of *akṣaras* occurred at two places: **vaḥbhā* for **bhāvaḥ* at f. 5r19, and *atayasya* for *ayatasya* at f. 6r13. On both occasions the mistake was noticed and corrected by the scribe.
5. Misreading of similar *akṣaras*. This category is often of special interest, as it may give clues as to the script or other characteristics of the exemplar copied from. In the case of our manuscript, however, there are not many clear indications. The relatively few errors¹⁰ which probably fall into this category include *ṇāṃ* for *ṇī* at f. 5r7, *ṣṭa* for *ṣva* at f. 5r13, *dyā* for *ḍyā* at f. 6r1 (though phonetic similarity may also be involved here), *ca* for *va* at f. 6r3, *pro* for *mo* at f. 6r15, *ivā* for *thā* at f. 7r2.
On the whole, this suggests, though not conclusively, that the exemplar was written in Devanāgarī, perhaps Jaina Devanāgarī. Certainly there are none of the mistakes typical of transcriptions from e.g. Śāradā script, and a source written in a Southern script can be effectively ruled out.
6. Substitution of phonetically similar *akṣaras*. *vispoṣanaṃ* for *visphoṣanaṃ* at f. 5v17 probably falls into this category.

There remain not a few mistakes for which no easy explanation can be given. Among the more surprising slips are *paṃcamo* for *prathamō* at f. 5r5 (colophon of 1.1), and *daḥsya* for *dagdhasya* at f. 5v17.

On three occasions in the course of copying the text of the VS the scribe discovered that he had omitted matter and supplied the deficiency in the body of the text itself, appropriately marked, rather than in the margin or squeezed between the lines. It is thus possible to see how long it took him to notice his mistake; in each case this apparently happened when he had arrived at the point in the following line directly below the place where he had omitted text.¹¹ In other places, omission has been corrected by squeezing an *akṣara* between the lines; less frequently by

¹⁰ The very fact that misreadings seem to be quite rare may suggest that the script of the exemplar was one with which the scribe was well familiar.

¹¹ Another interpretation of the evidence is possible, though I do not prefer it: it is conceivable that the scribe noted the error sooner and deliberately decided to supply the missing matter at a place directly beneath. But if he had seen the mistake after writing only a few more *akṣaras*

adding the matter to be inserted in the margins. *akṣaras* to be cancelled are marked by small dots placed above them, the number of dots being dependent on the size of the *akṣara*, varying between 2 and 5. In one case, medial *o*, which is formed by a vertical stroke before and one after the consonant sign, has been cancelled by a caret attached to the bottom of each of the two verticals (cf. footnote 18 on p. 211 below). Metathesis has been corrected in both cases where it occurred (see point 5 on p. 207 above) by adding small numbers above the *akṣaras* in question, indicating the order in which they should be read.

As far as I can tell, all corrections were probably made by the original scribe, nor are there any marginalia or other matter in a second hand. On the whole the scribe makes the impression of being careful and conscientious.

3.2.2.2 Ambiguities of the script

Even a diplomatic transcription unavoidably is to some degree an interpretation, and it is practically impossible to indicate at all places whether a particular character could conceivably also be read differently. I should warn those who consult the diplomatic transcription especially of the following points. The scribe's *ta* and *na*, both as separate *akṣaras* and in ligatures, differ but slightly and are sometimes virtually impossible to distinguish. The difference between the stroke of a *daṇḍa* and that of a *prṣṭhamātra e* (or *o*) is sometimes a matter of interpretation and context. I also find some of the ligatures with *g* almost indistinguishable, notably *gs*, *gr* and *gn* (and similarly *rgg* and so on).

The scribe does use different forms for *b* and *v*, but occasionally has the latter where the former is required. As in other Jaina Devanāgarī manuscripts, the scribe writes what looks like *dhe* for *dhi* so frequently that one is tempted to regard this as simply an alternate form. I have however transcribed as *dhe* even where I suspect *dhi* may have been intended.¹²

one would rather expect him to have cancelled those and continued correctly. It is just possible perhaps that when the scribe finished a line he checked what he had just written, and decided to be economical and not cancel out half a line or so due to his mistake. But this seems to me a rather unlikely degree of care and deliberation, and if it were the case one would perhaps have a right to expect that even fewer mistakes would have gone unnoticed. I prefer to think that now and then the scribe's eye wandered to the place in the line just above, and reading an *akṣara* or two discovered that he had made an omission.

¹² There are a few places where we find the *akṣara* with clearly recognizable medial *i* instead of medial *e*.

3.2.3 Diplomatic transcription

[f. 4v12] athāto dharmmaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ | yato bhyu[13]dayani¹³śreyasa-
siddhiḥ sa dharmmaḥ | tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmānyaṃ pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur
ākāśaṃ kālo dig ātmā mana iti dravyāṇi rūparasagaṃdhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ
parimā[14]ṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve vuddhayaḥ sukha-
duḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś ca guṇāḥ utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuṃcanaṃ
prasāraṇaṃ gamanaṃ iti karmāṇi [15] sad anityaṃ dravyavat kāryaṃ | kāraṇaṃ
sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravyaguṇakarmmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ | dravyāṇi dravyāṃtaram
ārabhamte guṇāś ca guṇāntaram | karma karmasādhyaṃ na vidyate [16] kāryāviro-
dhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhe ca | ubhayathā guṇaḥ | kāryavirodhi karmma kriyāvad
guṇavat samavāyikāraṇaṃ dravyaṃ iti dravyalakṣaṇaṃ | dravyāśrayy agūṇa-
vān saṃyo[17]gavibhāgeṣv akāraṇaṃ anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇaṃ ekadravyaṃ
agūṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇaṃ iti karmmalakṣaṇaṃ dravyagu-
ṇakarmmaṇām dravyakāraṇaṃ sāmānyaṃ [18] tathā guṇaḥ saṃyogavibhāgānām
karmma na dravyāṇām vyatirekāt guṇavaidharṇyān na karmmaṇām dravyāṇām
dravyaṃ kāryaṃ sāmānyaṃ | dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyo-
ga[19]vibhāgāś ca asamavāyāt sāmānyakārya karmma na vidyate | saṃyogānām
dravyaṃ rūpāṇām rūpaṃ | gurutvaprayatnasamṃyogānām utkṣepaṇaṃ | saṃyoga-
vibhāgāḥ karmmaṇām | kā[f. 5r]raṇasāmānye dravyakarmmaṇām karma kāraṇaṃ
uktam iti | cha prathamasyādyam āhnikam | cha ||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvo na tu kāryābhāvāt karaṇābhāvaḥ sāmānyaṃ viśeṣa [2]
iti buddhyapekṣaṃ bhāvo dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmmatvaṃ ca | sāmānyāni
viśeṣāś ca anyatrāṃtebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ sad iti yato dravyaguṇakarmmasu sā
sattā dravyaguṇakarmmaḥ [3] rthāṃtaram sattā | ekadravyatvān na dravyaṃ
guṇakarmmasu ca bhāvān na karmma na guṇaḥ | sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvāc ca ekadra-
vyatvena dravyatvaṃ uktam | sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca guṇe bhā[4]vād guṇatvaṃ
uktam | sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca karmmaṇi bhāvāt karmmatvaṃ uktam | sā-
mānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca karmmaṇi bhāvāt karmmatvaṃ uktam | sāmānyaviśeṣā-
bhāvena ca sa[5]līmgaṇaviśeṣāt viśeṣalīmgaṇābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ || cha || paṃcamo
dhyāyaḥ | cha ||

rūparasagaṃdhasparśavatī pṛthivī | rūparasasparśavatya āpo dravāḥ snigdhas ca |
tejo rūpa[6]rasasparśavat vāyu sparśavān | ta ākāśe na vidyamte | sarppirjatuma-
dhūcehiṣṭānām pāṛthivānām agnisamṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyaṃ | trapusīsa-
loharajātāsuvāṇā[7]nām taijasānām agnisamṃyogād bhavatādbhiḥ sāmānyaṃ |
viśānām kakudmān | prāṃte vāladhi sāsānān iti ti gotve dṛṣṭam līmgaṃ sparśaś ca
na ca dṛṣṭānām sparśa ity adṛṣṭalīmgo [8] vāyuh | adravyatvā dravyaṃ kriyāvatvāt
guṇavatvāc ceti | adravyatvena nityatvaṃ uktam | vāyor vvāyusaṃmūrchanaṃ

13 There is a dot above the line after the *nī*.

nānātve liṅgaṃ vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dr̥ṣṭaṃ [9] liṅgaṃ na vidyate | sāmānyatodr̥ṣṭā(c c)¹⁴āviśeṣaḥ | tasmād āgamikaṃ saṃjñākarma tv asmadviśiṣṭānāṃ liṅgaṃ | pratyakṣapūrvatvāt saṃjñākarmmaṇaḥ niḥkramaṇaṃ praveśa[10]nam ity ākāśasya liṅgatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvvāḥ kārye guṇo dr̥ṣṭaḥ kāryāṃtarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ | paratra pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na [11] manoguṇo liṅgam ākāśasya dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte tatvaṃ bhāvena || dvitīyasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

puṣpavastrayoh sati saṃnikarṣe gaṃdhāṃtarā || [12] prādurbhāvo vastre gaṃdhābhāvaliṅgaṃ | etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyāṃ gaṃdhaḥ tejasya uṣṇatā | apsu sītātā | aparasmin paraṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram i[13]ti kālaliṅgāni dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte | tatvaṃ bhāvena kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvaṃ nityeṣṭabhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt | kāraṇe kālākhyā || ita i[14]dam iti yatas tad diśāṃ liṅgaṃ dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte | tatvaṃ bhāvena kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvaṃ | ādityasamyogāt bhūtapūrvvād bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācī | ta[15]thā dakṣiṇā prācī | udīcī ca | etena digāṃtarāṇi vyākhyātāni | sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād viśeṣasmṛteṣ ca saṃśayaḥ | dr̥ṣṭaṃ adr̥ṣṭaṃ dr̥ṣṭaṃ ca dr̥ṣṭavat | dr̥ṣṭaṃ [16] yathādr̥ṣṭaṃ ayathādr̥ṣṭaṃ ubhayathādr̥ṣṭatvāt | vidyāvidyātaś ca saṃśayaḥ¹⁵ | śrotragrahaṇo yo rthaḥ sa śabdaḥ tasmīn dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmmeti saṃśayaḥ | tulyajātīyeṣv arthāṃ[17]tabhūteṣu ca viśeṣasyobhayathādr̥ṣṭatvāt | ekadravyatvān na dravyaṃ | acākṣuṣatvān na karma guṇasya sato 'pavarggaḥ karmmaḥ | sādharmaṃ sato liṅgābhāvāt | nityavaidha[18]rmyāt kāryatvāt śabdavyaṃjaka abhāvāt kāraṇato vikarāt doṣāt saṃyogād vibhāgāc chābdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ liṅgāc cānityaḥ dvayos tu pravṛtīyor abhāvāt | pra[19]māśabdāt | saṃpratipattibhāvāc ca saṃdigdhāḥ sati bahutve saṃkhyāvaḥbhā¹⁶ sāmānyataḥ prathamāśabdaḥ saṃpratipattibhāvaś ceti || śa || dvitīyo dhyāyaḥ || śa ||

+pra+siddhā indriyārthāḥ [f. 5v] indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāṃtare hetuḥ so napadeśaḥ kāraṇānāṃ ajñānāt kāryājñānād ajñānāc ca anya eva hetur ity a'napadeśaḥ [sic] | arthāṃtaraṃ hy arthāṃtarāsyā[2]napadeśaḥ saṃyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi virodhe ca | kāryaṃ kāryāṃtarasya kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāṃtarasya virodhyaṃ bhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtaṃ abhūtasyābhūtaṃ¹⁷ bhūtasya bhūtasya [3] prasiddhipūrvakatvād apadeśasya prasiddho 'padeśaḥ asat saṃdigdhāś cānapadeśaḥ | viśāṇī tasmād asvo viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti | ātmendriyamanorthasamnikarṣā[4]d yan niṣpadyate tad anyat pravṛtīnivṛtī pratyagātmani dr̥ṣṭe paratra liṅ-

14 The ligature is blotched.

15 The scribe first started to write something else, perhaps śya, instead of ya.

16 2 written over vaḥ, 1 over bhā, in other words correcting to °bhāvaḥ.

17 A ma has been added above the line after this, perhaps with the intention of correcting °bhūtaṃ bhūtasya to °bhūtaṃ abhūtasya.

gaṃ || cha || tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

ātmemdriyārthasamnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca mana[5]so liṅgaṃ | dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte | prayatnajñānāyugapadyāc caikaṃ prāṇāc caikaṃ prāṇāpānanimōṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīmdriyāṃtaravikārā[6]ḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni | dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vākhyāte | yajñadatta iti satī samnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭam na vidyate | sāmānya[7]todrṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ | tasmād āgamikaṃ nāham iti śabdayatirekā | yadi ca pratyakṣo haṃ devadatto haṃ yajñadatta iti | devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīti co[8]pacārāc charīrapratyakṣaḥ saṃdigdhas tūpacārāḥ | aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāṃtarapratyakṣaḥ na tu śarīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrāyor jñānaviśe[9]ṣaḥ sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmyam | nānāvasthātaḥ śāstrasāmāthyāc ca || cha || iti tṛtīyo dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

sad akāraṇavan nityam | tasya kāryam bhiṃ[10]gaṃ | kāraṇabhāvād dhi kāryabhāvāḥ | anityam iti ca viśeṣapratīṣedhabhāvāḥ | avidyāc ca | mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ | etena rasagaṃdhasparśe[11]ṣu jñānam vyākhyātam | tadabhāvād avyabhicārah | samkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve karmma ca rūpidravayasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi [12] arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt | etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvaṃdriyajñānam vyākhyātam || cha || caturthasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcā[13]tmakaṃ na vidyate | guṇāṃtarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyātmakaṃ api na ātmasaṃyogas tv apratīṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām tad ayonijaṃ | anekadeśapūrvvakatvāt dharmmaviśeṣāt [14] kāryaviśeṣāt samākhyābhāvāt | saṃjñādimatvāt vedalīṅgāc ca || cha || iti caturtho dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

ātmaprayatnasamīyogābhyām¹⁸ haste karmma tathā muśalakarmma hasta[15]-saṃyogāc cabhighātaje muśalakarmmaṇi vyatirekāc akāraṇam hastasaṃyogaḥ | tathātmasaṃyoge hastakarmmaṇi muśalābhighātāt tu muśalasaṃyogād dhaste karmma [16] tathātmakarmma hastasaṃyogāc ca | saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam | nodanaviśeṣābhāvān norddham na tīryag gamanam | prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ | nodanaviśeṣād u[17]dasanaviśeṣaḥ | hastakarmmaṇā dāraakarmma vyākhyātam tathā dakṣya viṣṭānam prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanam | tṛṇakarmma vāyusaṃyogān maṇigamanam sū[18]cyabhisarppanam ity adṛṣṭakāritāni | iṣāv ayugapat saṃyogaviśeṣaḥ karmmanyatve hetuḥ | nodanād ādyaṃ iṣoḥ karmma | tatkāritāc cottaram tathottaram uttaram ca | saṃ[19]skārābhāve gurutvāt panam || cha || pañcamasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

18 The scribe first wrote °prayoga°, then corrected this to °praya° by cancelling the o and the ga, and continued with ma.

nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāt pṛthivyām karmma | tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam | apām saṃyogābhāve [f. 6r] gurutvāt patanam | dravatvāt syaṃdanam | nadyā vāyusaṃyogād ārohanam nodanāt pīḍanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca | vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritam apām saṃghāto vilaya[2]nam ca tejasah saṃyogāt tatra vaspḥūrjathu liṅgam vaidikam ca apām saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca pṛthivīkarmmaṇā tejasah karmma kāyukarmma ca vyākhyātam | agner ūrddhajvalanam | vā[3]yos tiryak pacanam anumanasoś cādyam karmmeti adṛṣṭakāritāni hastakarmmaṇā manasaḥ karmma vyākhyātam | ātmendriyamano'rthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe | tadanā[4]rambhe ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyoga kāyakarmmaṇātmakarmma vyākhyātam | apasarpaṇam asitapītasamṃyogāḥ kāryāntarasamṃyogāś cetya[5]h || dṛṣṭakāritāni | tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo aprādurbhāvāś ca sa mokṣaḥ | dravyaguṇakarmmaniṣpattiḥ vaidharmmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamas tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca [6] tamaḥ | dikkālāv ākāśam ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmmyān niḥkriyāni | etena karmmaṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ | ni+ḥ+kriyāṇām samavāyah karmmaḥbyah pratiśiddhaḥ | kāraṇa[7]tve samavāyino guṇāḥ guṇai dig vyākhyātā | kāraṇena kāla iti || cha || iti paṃcamo dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedo na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam ṛṣeḥ | ta[8]thā vrāhmaṇe saṃjñākarmma siddhiliṅgam buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ | tathā pratigrahaḥ | tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṃgabhūtānām ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇa[9]tvāt | adṛṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāharato¹⁹ doṣaḥ | tad aduṣṭe na vidyate viśiṣṭe pravṛtti same hīno cāpravṛttiḥ | etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmmaikebhyah [10] parādāvaṃ vyākhyātam tathā viruddhānām tyagaḥ || ×²⁰ dayah | taḥ duṣṭabhojane na vidyate | duṣṭam himsāyām tatsamabhivyāharato ×²¹ same ātmatyāgaḥ | paratyāgo vā [11] viśiṣṭa ātmatyāga iti || cha || śaṣṭhasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

dṛṣṭānām dṛṣṭaprayojanānām dṛṣṭabhāve prayogo bhyudayāya abhiṣecanopavāsavrahmaca[12]ryagurukulavāsavānaprasthaya jñādānaprokṣaṇadignakṣatramamtrakālāniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || cāturāśramyam upadhāś cānupadhāś ca | bhāvadoṣa upadhā | adoṣo '[13]nupaka iṣṭarasarūpagam dhasparśaprokṣitam abhyukṣitam ca tac chuci śuci pratiśedhaḥ arthāmtaram ca | atayasya²² śucibhojanād ubhyudayo na vidyate | yamābhāvāt | vidya[14]ve cārthāmtaratvād yamasya asati cābhāvāt sukhād rāgaḥ | tanmayatvān tṛpteḥ | adṛṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣāḥ icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ tataḥ saṃyo[15]vibhāgāś ca | ātmakarmmasu prokṣo vyākhyātāḥ || cha || iti śaṣṭho dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

uktā guṇā guṇalakṣaṇam cokatam | idam evaṃguṇam idam evaṃguṇam iti cokatam |

19 After this there is an insertion mark (cf. footnote 20).

20 The scribe here realized he had omitted text earlier (cf. footnote 19) and added the missing portion between two crosses.

21 See footnote 20.

22 2 written over *ta* and 1 over *ya*, i.e. corrected to *ayatasya*.

prthivyām [16] rūparasagaṃdhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ agnisamyogāc ca |
 guṇāṃtaraprādurbhāvāt etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam | apsu tejasi vāyau ca
 nityāḥ dravyanityatvāt nitye[17]ṣv anityāḥ dravyānityatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvvāḥ
 prthivyām pākajāś ca | apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvvāḥ pākajā na vi-
 dyamte | agūṇavato dravyasya guṇāraṃbhāt karmmaṇā [18] guṇāḥ etena pākajā
 vyākhyātāḥ | ekadravyatvāt | aṇor mahatoś copalabdhyānupalabdhī nitye vyākhyā-
 te | kākāra+ṇa+bahutvāt kāraṇamahatvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat | vi[19]paritam
 aṇu mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca | ekakālatvāt dṛṣṭāntāc ca
 aṇutvamahatvayor aṇutvamahatvābhāvāḥ | karmmaṇair vyākhyātāḥ | aṇutvama-
 hattvā[f. 6v]bhyām karmmaguṇā agūṇāḥ | etena dīrghatvahasatve vyākhyāte |
 karmmaḥ karmmaṇi | guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ tad anitye nityam parimaṇḍalam | avidyā
 vidyāliṅgam vibhāvān mahān ākā[2]śas tathā cātmā tadabhāvād aṇu manah |
 guṇair dig vyākhyātāḥ | kāraṇena kāla iti || cha || saptamasyādyam āhnikam || cha ||

rūparasasparśavyatirekād arthāṃtaram ekatvam | tathā [3] prthaktvam | tayor
 nityatvānityatve | tejaso rūpasparśābhyām vyākhyāte | niṣpattiś ca | ekatvapṛtha-
 ktvayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyām vyākhyātāḥ | karma[4]bhiḥ
 karmmaṇi | guṇair guṇāḥ niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmmaguṇānām sarvvaikatvam na
 vidyate | ekasyābhāvād bhāktam na vidyate | kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād
 ekatvapṛthaktve na [5] vidyate | etad anityayor vyākhyātām | anyatarakarmmaja
 ubhayakarmmaja saṃyogajāś ca saṃyogāḥ | etena vibhāgo vyākhyātāḥ | saṃ-
 yogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhā[6]vo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyām vyākhyātāḥ |
 karmmaḥ karmmaṇi guṇair guṇāḥ | yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃ-
 yogavibhāgo na vidyate | guṇatvā guṇe ca bhāṣyate niḥ[7]kriyatvāt | ati nāstīti
 prayogāc chabdārthāḥ asaṃbaddhau | saṃyogino daṃḍāt samavāyino viśāṇāc
 ca dṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ | tathā pratyayābhāvāḥ saṃbaṃdhisambandhād
 i[8]ti cet saṃdehaḥ | sāmāyikāḥ śabdārthe pratyayaḥ ekaddikkālābhyām saṃ-
 nikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyām param aparam kāraṇatvāt kāraṇatvāc ca paratvāparatve
 paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvā[9]paratvayo 'bhāvo 'ṇutvamahatvābhyām vyākhyātāḥ |
 karmmaḥ karmmaṇi guṇaiḥ guṇāḥ iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ samavāyāḥ dra-
 vyatvaḥ guṇatvakarmmatvapratishedho [10] bhāvena vyākhyātāḥ | tatvam bhāvena |
 cha || iti saptamo dhyāyāḥ || cha ||

dravyeṣu jñānam vyākhyātām | mana ātmā cca | jñānanirddeśe jñānaniḥpattir
 uktā guṇakarmma[11]sv asaṃnivṛtteṣu | jñānaniṣpatte dravyam kāraṇam kāra-
 ṇakāraṇam ca sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam sāmānyā-
 viśeṣāpekṣam dravya[12]guṇakarmmasu dravye dravyaguṇakarmmapekṣam |
 guṇakarmmasu guṇakarmmaābhāvād guṇakarmmapekṣam na vidyate | samavā-
 yinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ te kāryakāraṇa(karmmaābhāvā)[13]bhūte iti |
 dravyeṣv anitaratarakāraṇāḥ | kāraṇāyau gapadyāt guṇakarmmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt

ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣam dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣu abhāvāt |
artha iti dravyaguṇakarmmasu || cha || aṣṭamasyādyāhnikam || cha ||

dravyeṣu pañcātmakam pratyuktam | bhūyastvāt gaṃdhavatvāc ca pṛthivī gaṃdha-
jñāne | tathāpas tejo vāyu[15]ś ca | rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣād iti | aṣṭamo
dhyāyah || cha ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asaṭ | sad asaṭ | asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād
arthām[16]taram | sac cāsaṭ | yac cānyat saṭ bhū²³ saṭ | asad iti bhūtapratyakṣābhā-
vād bhūtasmiter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca jñānam | tathā²⁴bhāve bhāvapratyakṣa-
tvāc ca | etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmma[17]ś ca vyākhyātāḥ | abhūtam nāstī²⁵da²⁵
ty anarthāmtaram | nāsti ghaṭo geḥa saṃyogapratīṣedhaḥ nāsty anyas caṃdramā iti
sāmānyāc caṃdramasi pratīṣedhaḥ | sad asato vaidharmmyāt [18] kārye sadasattā
na ātmany²⁶ ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam tathā dravyāmtareṣu
ātmendriyamano'rthasamnikarṣāc ca | tatsamavāyāt karmmaguṇeṣu ā[19]tma-
samavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu asyedaṃ kāryam kāraṇam sambandhekārthasamavāyī
virodhi ceti laimḡikam | etena śabdaṃ vyākhyātāḥ | hetur apadeśo liṃgam ni-
mittam pramāṇam kāra[f. 7r]ṇam ity anarthāmtaram asyodam iti buddhyapekṣatvāt |
ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ tatvā svapnaḥ svapnāmtikam
dharmmāc ca indriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā [2] tad duṣṭam jñānam | aduṣṭam
vidyā | ārṣasiddhadarśanam ca dharmmebhyah || cha || iti navamo 'dhyāyah |

ātmamavāyah sukhaduḥkhayor arthāmtaratve hetuḥ tadāśrayebhyaś ca guṇe-
bhyah iṣṭāni[3]ṣṭakāraṇavirodhād viśeṣāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkhayor arthānta-
rabhāvaḥ saṃśayanirṇayāmtarabhāvaś ca jñānāmtaratve hetuḥ | tayor niṣpattiḥ
pratyakṣalaimḡikābhyām vākhyātā | bhūtam i[4]ti pratyakṣam vyākhyātāḥ | bha-
viṣyatīti kāryāmtare dṛṣṭatvāt tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo napekṣebhyaś ca abhūd
ity abhūtāt | sati ca²⁷ kāryāsamavāyāt ekārthasamavāyiṣu [5] kāraṇāmtareṣu | ta-
darśanāt meka²⁸ iti | śiraḥ pṛṣṭam udaram pāṇṇir iti | tadviśeṣebhyaḥ kāraṇam iti
dravye kāryasamavāyāt (syā) saṃyogād (v)ā kāraṇasamavāyāt karmmaṇi [6] tathā
rūpe kāraṇakāraṇasama²⁹deśa²⁹vāyāc ca | kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge | kāraṇa-
kāraṇasamavāyāc ca | saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikam laimḡike pramāṇam
vyākhyā[7]tam | daśamasyādyāhnikam || cha ||

23 There is an insertion mark after this (cf. footnote 25 below).

24 *thā* possibly corrected from *thām*.

25 The scribe here realized and corrected his earlier omission by adding *da* between crosses (cf. footnote 23).

26 ātmany: MS^{pc}, ātmāny MS^{cc}

27 sati ca: MS^{pc}, saciti MS^{cc}; corrected by cancelling the *i* on *ci* and adding 1 over *ti* and 2 over *ca*.

28 There is an insertion mark after this (cf. footnote 29 below).

29 The scribe realized his earlier omission here and added *deśa* between two crosses (cf. footnote 28).

dr̥ṣṭānām dr̥ṣṭaprayojanānām dr̥ṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya tadvacanād āmnā-
yaprāmāṇyaṃ || cha || iti daśamo dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ || cha || samāptāni [8] vaiśeṣi-
kasūtrāṇi || cha || śrīḥ ||

athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ || 1.1.1 ||
yato 'bhyudayaniḥśreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmah || 1.1.2 ||
tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 1.1.3 ||
pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśam kālo dig ātmā mana iti dravyāṇi ||
1.1.4 ||
rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavi-
bhāgau paratvāparatve buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau pra-
yatnaś ca guṇāḥ || 1.1.5 ||
utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuñcanaṃ prasāraṇam gamanam iti
karmāṇi || 1.1.6 ||
sad anityam dravyavat kāryam kāraṇam sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravya-
guṇakarmanām aviśeṣaḥ || 1.1.7 ||
dravyāṇi dravyāntaram ārabhante || 1.1.8 ||
guṇāś ca guṇāntaram || 1.1.9 ||
karma karmasādhyam na vidyate || 1.1.10 ||
kāryāvirodhi dravyam kāraṇāvirodhi ca || 1.1.11 ||
ubhayathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.12 ||
kāryāvirodhi karma || 1.1.13 ||
kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇam dravyam iti dravyalakṣaṇam ||
1.1.14 ||
dravyāśrayy aguṇavān saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti gu-
ṇalakṣaṇam || 1.1.15 ||
ekadravyam aguṇam saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣam kāraṇam iti
karmalakṣaṇam || 1.1.16 ||
dravyaguṇakarmanām dravyam kāraṇam sāmānyam || 1.1.17 ||
tathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.18 ||
saṃyogavibhāgānām karma || 1.1.19 ||
na dravyāṇām vyatīrekāt || 1.1.20 ||
guṇavaidharmyān na karmanām || 1.1.21 ||
dravyāṇām dravyam kāryam sāmānyam || 1.1.22 ||
dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgāś ca ||
1.1.23 ||
asamavāyāt sāmānyam kāryam karma na vidyate || 1.1.24 ||
saṃyogānām dravyam || 1.1.25 ||
rūpāṇām rūpam || 1.1.26 ||
gurutvaprayatnasamāyogānām utkṣepaṇam || 1.1.27 ||
saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmanām || 1.1.28 ||

iti prathamasyādyam āhnikam ||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvaḥ || 1.2.1 ||
na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ || 1.2.2 ||
sāmānyam viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam || 1.2.3 ||
bhāvaḥ || 1.2.4 ||
dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmatvaṃ ca sāmānyāni viśeṣāś ca || 1.2.5 ||
anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ || 1.2.6 ||
sad iti yato dravyaguṇakarmasu sā sattā || 1.2.7 ||
dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaram sattā || 1.2.8 ||
ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 1.2.9 ||
guṇakarmasu ca bhāvān na karma na guṇaḥ || 1.2.10 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāc ca || 1.2.11 ||
ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam || 1.2.12 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.13 ||
guṇe bhāvād guṇatvam uktam || 1.2.14 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.15 ||
karmaṇi bhāvāt karmatvam uktam || 1.2.16 ||
sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.17 ||
sallīṅgaviśeṣād viśeṣalīṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ || 1.2.18 ||
[iti] prathamō 'dhyāyaḥ ||

rūparasagandhasparśavatī pṛthivī || 2.1.1 ||
rūparasasparśavatya āpo dravāḥ snigdhas ca || 2.1.2 ||
tejo rūpasparśavat³² || 2.1.3 ||

- 30 It seems far more likely that the manuscript's *karma kāraṇam* is an instance of the fairly common error of omission of the stroke for medial *ā* than that this anomalous reading—an explicit contradiction of the Vaiśeṣika axiom that motions may produce qualities (conjunctions and disjunctions) but do not directly produce substances or other actions—is to be attributed to the hyparchetype.
- 31 I regard the *iti* after this as belonging (in the hyparchetype at least) to the colophon, though placed before the double *danḍas* and *cha*. Note that the scribe is very inconsistent with regard to his *itis* at the end of *āhnikas* and *adhyāyas*, sometimes writing one after and sometimes before the double *danḍas* and *cha*, and sometimes omitting one altogether. As was already remarked above (p. 191 above) it is quite common for an *iti* which clearly belongs to a colophon rather than the actual text to 'migrate' backwards and be written before the *danḍa(s)* which one expects to separate the two. In the following I consistently regard concluding *itis* as belonging to the colophon and supply them where they are omitted; admittedly this is hairsplitting which may be superfluous, as it is very doubtful whether it is possible or useful to reconstruct the colophons of the hyparchetype, and the consistency thus imposed may be one which never existed.
- 32 It is far more probable that the manuscript's *rūparasasparśavat* is a result of scribal carelessness

ta ākāśe na vidyante || 2.1.5 ||
 sarpiṛjatumadhūcchiṣṭānām pārthivānām agniśaṃyogād dravatādbhiḥ
 sāmānyam || 2.1.6 ||
 trapuṣīsaloharajatasuvarṇānām taijasānām agniśaṃyogād dra-
 vatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.7 ||
 viṣāṇī kakudmān prāṇtevalādhiḥ sāsnāvān iti gotve dṛṣṭam liṅgam |
 2.1.8 ||
 sparśaś ca || 2.1.9 ||
 na ca dṛṣṭānām sparśa ity adṛṣṭaliṅgo vāyuh || 2.1.10 ||
 adravyatvād dravyam || 2.1.11 ||
 kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ceti || 2.1.12 ||
 adravyatvena nityatvam uktam || 2.1.13 ||
 vāyor vāyusaṃmūrchanaṃ nānātve liṅgam || 2.1.14 ||
 vāyur iti [sati] saṃnikarṣe³³ pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭam liṅgam na vidya-
 te || 2.1.15 ||
 sāmānyato dṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 2.1.16 ||
 tasmād āgamikam || 2.1.17 ||
 saṃjñākarma tv asmadvīṣṭānām liṅgam || 2.1.18 ||
 pratyakṣapūrvakatvāt saṃjñākarmaṇaḥ || 2.1.19 ||
 niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgatvāt || 2.1.20 ||
 kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ kārye guṇo dṛṣṭaḥ || 2.1.21 ||
 kāryāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ || 2.1.22 ||
 paratra pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ || 2.1.23 ||
 liṅgam ākāśasya || 2.1.24 ||
 dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.1.25 ||
 tattvam bhāvena || 2.1.26 ||
 [iti] dvitīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

 puṣpavastrayoḥ sati saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre
 gandhābhāvaliṅgam || 2.2.1 ||

than that there actually were Vaiśeṣikas who held such a view, though it should be noted that
 Praśastapāda finds it necessary to explain the (apparent) occurrence of taste in metals which
 are thought to be fire-substances, writing *tatra saṃyuktasamavāyād rasādyupalabdīḥ* (PDhS
 39.10–11).

- 33 On balance, it seems probable that the omission of *sati* here is due to error in the transmis-
 sion after the hyparchetype. Note that in the sūtras 2.2.1 and 3.2.7, which are similarly worded,
 the manuscript does have *sati*; especially 3.2.7 is very closely parallel, only differing in having
yajñadatta for *vāyur*. The error may be classified either as due to homoeoteleuton, the eye of
 the scribe skipping from the *ti* of *iti* to that of *sati*, or as a kind of haplography, *sati* and *saṃni*³³
 being very similar.

vyavasūnīṇaṁ pūṇavyaṁ gaurāṇaṁ || 2.2.3 ||

tejasy uṣṇatā || 2.2.4 ||

apsu śītātā || 2.2.5 ||

aparasmīn paraṁ yugapad ayugapac ciraṁ kṣīpraṁ iti kālalingāni ||

2.2.6 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.7 ||

tattvaṁ bhāvena || 2.2.8 ||

kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.9 ||

nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt || 2.2.10 ||

kāraṇe kālākhyā || 2.2.11 ||

ita idam iti yatas tad diśāṁ liṅgam || 2.2.12 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.13 ||

tattvaṁ bhāvena || 2.2.14 ||

kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.15 ||

ādityasaṁyogād bhūtapūrvād bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācī || 2.2.16 ||

tathā dakṣiṇā prācīcy udīcī ca || 2.2.17 ||

etena digantarāṇi vyākhyātāni || 2.2.18 ||

sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād viśeṣasmarṭeś ca saṁśayaḥ ||

2.2.19 ||

drṣṭam adrṣṭam || 2.2.20 ||

drṣṭam ca drṣṭavat || 2.2.21 ||

drṣṭam yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭam ubhayathādrṣṭatvāt || 2.2.22 ||

vidyāvidyātaś ca saṁśayaḥ || 2.2.23 ||

śrotragrahaṇo yo 'rthaḥ sa śabdah || 2.2.24 ||

tasmin dravyaṁ guṇaḥ karmeti saṁśayaḥ || 2.2.25 ||

tulyajātiyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu ca viśeṣasyobhayathādrṣṭatvāt ||

2.2.26 ||

ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 2.2.27 ||

acākṣuṣatvān na karma || 2.2.28 ||

guṇasya sato 'pavargaḥ karmabhiḥ sādharṁyam || 2.2.29 ||

sato liṅgābhāvāt || 2.2.30 ||

nityavaidharṁyāt || 2.2.31 ||

kāryatvāt || 2.2.32 ||

śabdavyaṅjaka abhāvāt || 2.2.33 ||

kāraṇato vikārāt || 2.2.34 ||

doṣāt || 2.2.35 ||

saṁyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ || 2.2.36 ||

liṅgāc cānityaḥ || 2.2.37 ||

dvayos tu pravṛtṭyor abhāvāt || 2.2.38 ||

[saṃkhyābhāvāt]³⁴ || 2.2.39 ||
 prathamāśabdāt || 2.2.40 ||
 sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.41 ||
 saṃdigdhāḥ sati bahutve || 2.2.42 ||
 saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ || 2.2.43 ||
 prathamāśabdaḥ || 2.2.44 ||
 sampratipattibhāvaś ca || 2.2.45 ||
 iti dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

prasiddhā indriyārthāḥ || 3.1.1 ||
 indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntare hetuḥ || 3.1.2 ||
 so 'napadeśaḥ || 3.1.3 ||
 kāraṇānām ajñānāt || 3.1.4 ||
 kāryājñānāt || 3.1.5 ||
 ajñānāc ca || 3.1.6 ||
 anya eva hetur iti anapadeśaḥ || 3.1.7 ||
 arthāntaram hy arthāntarasyānapadeśaḥ || 3.1.8 ||
 saṃyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ca kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya
 kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtaṃ
 abhūtasyābhūtaṃ abhūtasya bhūtaṃ bhūtasya || 3.1.9 ||
 prasiddhipūrvakatvād apadeśasya || 3.1.11 ||
 prasiddho 'padeśaḥ || 3.1.12 ||
 asan saṃdigdhaś cānapadeśaḥ || 3.1.13 ||
 viśāṇī tasmād aśvo viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti || 3.1.14 ||
 ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣād yan niṣpadyate tad anyat || 3.1.15 ||
 pravṛttinivṛtī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam || 3.1.16 ||
 [iti] tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca manaso liṅgam ||
 3.2.1 ||
 dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.2 ||
 prayatnajñānāyugapadyāc caikam || 3.2.3 ||
 prāṇac caikam³⁵ || 3.2.4 ||
 prāṇāpānanimēṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe
 icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni || 3.2.5 ||
 dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.6 ||

34 Assuming this sūtra to have been lost as a result of eyeskip (homocoteleuton). That it was not lacking in the hyparchetype is suggested, to my mind, by the presence of 2.2.43.

35 See p. 232 below.

yajñadatta iti sati saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭam [līṅgam]³⁶ na
 vidyate || 3.2.7 ||
 sāmānyato dṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.8 ||
 tasmād āgamikam || 3.2.9 ||
 nāham iti śabdavyatirekāt || 3.2.10 ||
 yadi ca pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti || 3.2.11 ||
 devadatto gacchatīti viṣṇumitro gacchatīti copacārāc charāpratyakṣaḥ ||
 3.2.12 ||
 saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ || 3.2.13 ||
 aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāntarapratyakṣaḥ ||
 3.2.14 ||
 na tu śārīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñānaviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.15 ||
 sukhaduḥkhañjñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmīyam || 3.2.16 ||
 nānāvasthātaḥ || 3.2.17 ||
 śāstrasāmarthyāc ca || 3.2.18 ||
 iti tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

sad akāraṇavan nityam || 4.1.1 ||
 tasya kāryaṃ līṅgam || 4.1.2 ||
 kāraṇabhāvād dhi kāryabhāvaḥ || 4.1.3 ||
 anityam iti ca viśeṣapratīṣedhabhāvaḥ || 4.1.4 ||
 avidyā ca || 4.1.5 ||
 mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ || 4.1.6 ||
 etena rasagandhasparśeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.7 ||
 tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ || 4.1.8 ||
 saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve
 karma ca rūpidravayasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāṇi || 4.1.9 ||
 arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt || 4.1.10 ||
 etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.11 ||
 [iti] caturthasyādyam āhnikam ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakam na
 vidyate || 4.2.1 ||
 guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyaत्मakam api na || 4.2.2 ||
 ātmasaṃyogas tv apratīṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām || 4.2.3 ||
 tad ayonijam || 4.2.4 ||

36 I assume that this word, present in all other versions, has been omitted due to scribal error post-dating the hyparchetype, though there is no clear cause of eyeskip. In the parallel sūtra 2.1.15 the manuscript does have *līṅgam*.

anekadeśapūrvakatvāt || 4.2.5 ||
 dharmaviśeṣāt || 4.2.6 ||
 kāryaviśeṣāt || 4.2.7 ||
 samākhyābhāvāt || 4.2.8 ||
 samjñādimattvāt || 4.2.9 ||
 vedalingāc ca || 4.2.10 ||
 iti caturtho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmprayatnasamīyogābhyām haste karma || 5.1.1 ||
 tathā musalakarma hastasamīyogāc ca || 5.1.2 ||
 abhigātaye musalakarmaṇi vyatirekād akāraṇaṁ hastasamīyogaḥ ||
 5.1.3 ||
 tathātmāsamīyogo hastakarmaṇi || 5.1.4 ||
 musalābhighātāt tu musalasamīyogād dhaste karma || 5.1.5 ||
 tathātmakarma hastasamīyogāc ca || 5.1.6 ||
 samīyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.7 ||
 nodanaviśeṣābhāvān nordhvaṁ na tiryag gamanam || 5.1.8 ||
 prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.9 ||
 nodanaviśeṣād udasanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.10 ||
 hastakarmaṇā dāraakarma vyākhyātam || 5.1.11 ||
 tathā dagdhasya visphoṭanam || 5.1.12 ||
 prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanam || 5.1.13 ||
 tṛṇakarma vāyusamīyogāt || 5.1.14 ||
 maṇigamanam sūcyabhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.1.15 ||
 iṣāv ayugapat samīyogaviśeṣaḥ karmānyatve hetuḥ || 5.1.16 ||
 nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma tatkāritāc cottaram tathottaram uttaram
 ca || 5.1.17 ||
 samskārābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.18 ||
 [iti] pañcamasyādyam āhnikam ||

nodanābhighātāt samyuktasamīyogāt pṛthivyām karma || 5.2.1 ||
 tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.2 ||
 apām samīyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.2.3 ||
 dravatvāt syandanam || 5.2.4 ||
 nāḍyā vāyusamīyogād ārohaṇam || 5.2.5 ||
 nodanāt pīḍanāt samyuktasamīyogāc ca || 5.2.6 ||
 vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.7 ||
 apām samghāto vilayanam ca tejasah samīyogāt || 5.2.8 ||
 tatrāvasphūrjathur liṅgam || 5.2.9 ||
 vaidikam ca || 5.2.10 ||

apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca || 5.2.11 ||
 pṛthivīkarmanā tejasah karma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam || 5.2.12 ||
 agner ūrdhvajvalanaṃ vāyos tiryak pavanam aṇumanasoś cādyam
 karmety adr̥ṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.13 ||
 hastakarmanā manasah karma vyākhyātam || 5.2.14 ||
 ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe || 5.2.15 ||
 tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ
 saṃyogah || 5.2.16 ||
 kāyakarmanātmakarma vyākhyātam || 5.2.17 ||
 apasarpaṇam [upasarpaṇam]³⁷ aśītapītasam̐yogāḥ kāryāntarasam̐yogāś
 cety adr̥ṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.18 ||
 tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣah || 5.2.19 ||
 ✓ dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamaḥ || 5.2.20 ||
 ✓ tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca tamaḥ || 5.2.21 ||
 dikḥkālāv ākāśam ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmyān niḥkriyāṇi || 5.2.22 ||
 etena karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ || 5.2.23 ||
 niḥkriyāṇāṃ samavāyah karmabhyah pratiśiddhaḥ || 5.2.24 ||
 kāraṇam tv asamavāyino guṇah³⁸ || 5.2.25 ||
 guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 5.2.26 ||
 kāraṇena kālāḥ || 5.2.27 ||
 iti pañcamo 'dhyāyah ||

buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedah || 6.1.1 ||
 na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam r̥ṣeḥ || 6.1.2 ||
 tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam || 6.1.3 ||
 buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ || 6.1.4 ||
 tathā pratigrahaḥ || 6.1.5 ||
 tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām || 6.1.6 ||
 ātmaguṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt || 6.1.7 ||
 aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato 'bhyudayah || 6.1.8 ||
 tad duṣṭabhojane na vidyate || 6.1.9 ||
 duṣṭam hiṃsāyām || 6.1.10 ||
 tatsamabhivyāhārato doṣah || 6.1.11 ||
 tad aduṣṭe na vidyate || 6.1.12 ||
 viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ || 6.1.13 ||
 same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ || 6.1.14 ||

37 Obviously omitted as a result of eyeskip.

38 I assume that the *kāraṇaṇve samavāyino guṇah* of the manuscript is an error for this, seeing no way to interpret that reading sensibly, nor another likely hyparchetype reading.

etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyaḥ parādānaṃ vyākhyātam ||
6.1.15 ||

tathā viruddhānāṃ tyāgaḥ || 6.1.16 ||

sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā || 6.1.17 ||

viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ || 6.1.18 ||

iti śaṣṭhasyādyam āhnikam ||

dr̥ṣṭānāṃ dr̥ṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dr̥ṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya'
6.2.1 ||

abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthyayajñadāna-
prokṣaṇadinnaḥsatramantrakālaniyamās cādr̥ṣṭāya || 6.2.2 ||

cāturāśramyam || 6.2.3 ||

upadhās cānupadhās ca || 6.2.4 ||

bhāvadoṣa upadhā || 6.2.5 ||

adoṣo 'nupadhā || 6.2.6 ||

iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ prokṣitam abhyukṣitam ca tac chuci ||
6.2.7 ||

[aśuci] śuci pratiśedhaḥ || 6.2.8 ||

arthāntaram ca || 6.2.9 ||

ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt || 6.2.10 ||

vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya || 6.2.11 ||

asati cābhāvāt || 6.2.12 ||

sukhād rāgaḥ || 6.2.13 ||

tanmayatvāt || 6.2.14 ||

tr̥pteh || 6.2.15 ||

adr̥ṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ || 6.2.16 ||

icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛtṭiḥ || 6.2.17 ||

tataḥ saṃyogo vibhāgaś ca || 6.2.18 ||

ātmakarmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ || 6.2.19 ||

iti śaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

uktā guṇāḥ || 7.1.1 ||

guṇalakṣaṇaṃ coktam || 7.1.2 ||

idam evaṃguṇam idam evaṃguṇam iti coktam || 7.1.3 ||

pṛthivyām rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ || 7.1.4 ||

agnisaṃyogāc ca || 7.1.5 ||

guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt || 7.1.6 ||

etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam || 7.1.7 ||

apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyanityatvāt || 7.1.8 ||

anityeṣv³⁹ anityā dravyānityatvāt || 7.1.9 ||
 kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajāś ca || 7.1.10 ||
 apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pākajā na vidyante || 7.1.11 ||
 agūnavato dravyasya guṇārambhāt karmaguṇā agūṇāḥ || 7.1.12 ||
 etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ || 7.1.13 ||
 ekadravyatvāt || 7.1.14 ||
 aṇor mahatoś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || 7.1.15 ||
 kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || 7.1.16 ||
 viparītam aṇu || 7.1.17 ||
 [aṇu]⁴⁰ mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca || 7.1.18 ||
 ekakālatvāt || 7.1.19 ||
 dṛṣṭāntāc ca || 7.1.20 ||
 aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvāḥ karmaguṇair vyākhyātāḥ ||
 7.1.21 ||
 aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā agūṇāḥ || 7.1.22 ||
 etena dīrghatvahasvatve vyākhyāte || 7.1.23 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.24 ||
 guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ || 7.1.25 ||
 tad anitye || 7.1.26 ||
 nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam || 7.1.27 ||
 avidyā vidyāliṅgam || 7.1.28 ||
 vibhavan mahān ākāśaḥ || 7.1.29 ||
 tathā cātmā || 7.1.30 ||
 tadabhāvād aṇu manāḥ || 7.1.31 ||
 guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 7.1.32 ||
 kāraṇena kālaḥ || 7.1.33 ||
 iti saptamasyādyam āhnikam ||
 rūparasa[gandha]sparśavyatirekā⁴¹ arthāntaram ekatvam || 7.2.1 ||
 tathā pṛthaktvam || 7.2.2 ||
 tayor nityānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte || 7.2.3 ||
 niṣpattiś ca || 7.2.4 ||
 ekatvapṛthaktvayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyā-
 khyātāḥ || 7.2.5 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.6 ||

39 I am unable to believe that the *nityeṣv* of the manuscript can be anything but a scribal error which was not in the hyparchetype.

40 Assuming haplography.

41 I cannot imagine that the omission of *gandha* goes back to the hyparchetype, although there is nothing that can easily have provoked the error.

- guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.7 ||
 niḥsaṃkhyatvāt karmaguṇānām sarvaikatvaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.8 ||
 ekasyābhāvād bhāktam na vidyate || 7.2.9 ||
 kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete
 7.2.10 ||
 etad anityayor vyākhyātam || 7.2.11 ||
 anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ || 7.2.12 ||
 etena vibhāgo vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.13 ||
 saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyām
 vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.14 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.15 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.16 ||
 yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete
 7.2.17 ||
 guṇatvāt || 7.2.18 ||
 guṇe ca bhāṣyate || 7.2.19 ||
 niḥkriyatvāt || 7.2.20 ||
 asati nāstīti prayogāt || 7.2.21 ||
 śabdārthāḥ asambaddhau || 7.2.22 ||
 saṃyogino daṇḍāt samavāyino viśāṇac ca || 7.2.23 ||
 drṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ || 7.2.24 ||
 tathā pratyayābhāvaḥ || 7.2.25 ||
 sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ || 7.2.26 ||
 sāmāyikāḥ śabdārthapratyayaḥ || 7.2.27 ||
 ekadikkālābhyām saṃnikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyām param aparam
 7.2.28 ||
 kāraṇa[para]tvāt kāraṇā[para]tvāc⁴² ca paratvāparatve || 7.2.29 ||
 paratvāparatvayoḥ paratvāparatvābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyām vyā-
 khyātaḥ || 7.2.30 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.31 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.32 ||
 iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ [sa]⁴³ samavāyaḥ || 7.2.33 ||
 dravyatvagūnatvakarmatvapratīṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.34 ||
 tattvaṃ bhāvena || 7.2.35 ||
 iti saptamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

42 There is no obvious reason why °para° should have been twice omitted, but the resulting reading is anomalous and uninterpretable.

43 Assuming haplography.

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 8.1.1 ||
 mana ātmā ca || 8.1.2 ||
 jñānanirdeśe jñānaniṣpattir uktā || 8.1.3 ||
 guṇakarmasv asaṃnivṛtteṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇa-
 kāraṇaṃ ca || 8.1.4 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānam || 8.1.5 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣāpekṣaṃ dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.1.6 ||
 dravye dravyaguṇakarmāpekṣam || 8.1.7 ||
 guṇakarmasu guṇakarmābhāvād guṇakarmāpekṣaṃ na vidyate ||
 8.1.8 ||
 samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ [śvete buddhis]⁴⁴ te kāryakā-
 raṇabhūte iti || 8.1.9 ||
 dravyeṣv anitaretarakāraṇāḥ || 8.1.10 ||
 kāraṇāyau gapadyāt || 8.1.11 ||
 guṇakarmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt || 8.1.12 ||
 ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣam || 8.1.13 ||
 dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adrṣṭeṣv abhāvāt || 8.1.14 ||
 artha iti dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.1.15 ||
 [ity] aṣṭamasyādyam āhnikam ||

dravyeṣu pañcātmakaṃ pratyuktam || 8.2.1 ||
 bhūyastvād gandhavattvāc ca pṛthivī gandhajñāne || 8.2.2 ||
 tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt || 8.2.3 ||
 ity aṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asat || 9.1 ||
 sad asat || 9.2 ||
 asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram || 9.3 ||
 sac cāsat || 9.4 ||
 yac cānyat satas tad asat⁴⁵ || 9.5 ||
 asad iti bhūtapratyakṣābhāvād bhūtasmiter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca
 jñānam || 9.6 ||
 tathābhāve bhāvapratyakṣatvāc ca || 9.7 ||
 etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ || 9.8 ||
 abhūtaṃ nāstīty anarthāntaram || 9.9 ||

⁴⁴ Assuming an omission caused by eyeskip from °buddheḥ to buddhis: I am at a loss how to construe the sūtra otherwise.

⁴⁵ The manuscript is clearly corrupt at this point: the solution proposed, assuming among other things an error of *bhū* for *ta*, is little more than a guess.

nāsti ghaṭo geḥa [iti sato ghaṭasya geḥa]saṃyogapraṭiṣedhaḥ⁴⁶
9.10 ||

nāsty anyas candramā iti sāmānyāc candramasi praṭiṣedhaḥ || 9.11 ||

sadasator vaidharmyāt kārye sadasattā na || 9.12 ||

ātmany ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam || 9.13 ||

tathā dravyāntareṣu || 9.14 ||

ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāc ca || 9.15 ||

tatsamavāyāt karmaguṇeṣu || 9.16 ||

ātmāsamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu || 9.17 ||

asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti
laiṅgikam || 9.18 ||

etena śabdaṃ vyākhyātam || 9.19 ||

hetur apadeśo liṅgaṃ nimittaṃ pramāṇaṃ kāraṇam ity anarthāntaram

9.20 ||

asyedaṃ iti buddhyapekṣatvāt || 9.21 ||

ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ || 9.22 ||

tathā svapnaḥ svapnāntikam || 9.23 ||

dharmāc ca || 9.24 ||

indriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā || 9.25 ||

tad duṣṭaṃ jñānam || 9.26 ||

aduṣṭaṃ vidyā || 9.27 ||

ārṣaṃ siddhadarśanaṃ ca dharmebhyaḥ || 9.28 ||

iti navamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmāsamavāyaḥ sukhaduḥkḥayor arthāntaratve hetus tadāśrayebhyaś
ca guṇebhyaḥ || 10.1.1 ||

iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇavirodhād viśeṣāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkḥayor arthāntarabhāvaḥ
10.1.2 ||

saṃśayanirṇayāntarabhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ || 10.1.3 ||

tayor niṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṅgikābhyāṃ vyākhyātā || 10.1.4 ||

bhūtam iti pratyakṣaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.1.5 ||

bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare dṛṣṭatvāt || 10.1.6 ||

tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo 'napekṣebhyaś ca || 10.1.7 ||

abhūd ity abhūtāt || 10.1.8 ||

sati ca kāryāsamavāyāt || 10.1.9 ||

ekārthasamavāyiṣu kāraṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa iti || 10.1.10 ||

śīraḥ pṛṣṭham udaraṃ pāṇir iti tadviśeṣebhyaḥ || 10.1.11 ||

kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāt || 10.1.12 ||

46 Assuming omission due to eyeskip.

saṃyogād vā || 10.1.13 ||
 kāraṇasamavāyāt karmāṇi || 10.1.14 ||
 tathā rūpe kāraṇakāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.1.15 ||
 kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge || 10.1.16 ||
 kāraṇakāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.1.17 ||
 saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikam || 10.1.18 ||
 laiṅgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.1.19 ||
 [iti] daśamasyādyam āhnikam ||

dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya ||
 10.2.1 ||
 tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 10.2.2 ||
 iti daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||
 samāptāni vaiśeṣikasūtrāṇi ||

3.2.5 Analysis of variants

Difficult though it is to come to conclusions about the text-quality of the hyparchetype and its relation to other versions of the VS, some remarks and suggestions on these points must be made. Though considerably more detailed than the preliminary observations made in Isaacson 1995, section II, these are still very tentative. To go much deeper, however, would involve considering a large number of individual sūtras in great detail, taking into consideration all possible evidence, including testimonia, and must remain a matter for later studies.

To begin with, we may look at what evidence can be found about the nature of the latest ancestor of the manuscript; the question I wish to address is whether this consisted of a text of the sūtras alone or contained them within a commentary.⁴⁷

It must be noted that there is no attempt to provide numbering of the sūtras. It seems certain that the scribe uses punctuation to mark the ends of sūtras, but it is also quite clear that he is by no means thorough in this respect, even if we allow that the non-application of sandhi may also sometimes serve the same purpose. In many cases there is nothing except the sense (and the parallel recensions) to tell us that we have two sūtras rather than one.⁴⁸ More significantly, there are a few places where it seems certain that the scribe failed to identify the end of sūtras correctly, placing a *daṇḍa* within what must be taken as a single sūtra.⁴⁹ This renders it unlikely that the *sūtrapāṭha* was extracted by the scribe from a manuscript with the sūtras embedded in a commentary (or indeed from a manuscript of a commentary in which the sūtras were omitted or given only in *pratīkas*), for a scribe capable of doing that might well have made mistakes, it is true, but they would probably not be of this particular kind.

A second, even stronger, argument that points to the same conclusion can be made on the basis of some of the cases of omission of text due to eyeskip or haplography. When the eyeskip is between words in different sūtras,⁵⁰ this phenomenon seems to me wholly inconsistent with the assumption of a learned scribe extracting the sūtras from their surrounding commentary; it can only be plausibly explained if

47 Preliminary remarks on this topic are to be found in Isaacson 1995, 753–754.

48 E.g. *etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā vyavasthitāḥ pṛthivyām gaṇḍhaḥ* f. 5r12 (2.2.2–3).

49 See *gaṇḍhāntarā|| prādurbhāvo* (for *gaṇḍhāntarāprādurbhāvo*) at f. 5r11–12 (2.2.1), *cetyaḥ dr̥ṣṭakāritāni* for *cetyaḥ adr̥ṣṭakāritāni* at f. 6r4–5 (5.2.13), *guṇakarmmasv asaṃvṛttena pādānāniṣpāte dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca* at f. 6v10–11 (8.1.4). The fact that all these instances involve the end of a line and the beginning of the next is in my view probably significant, but does not invalidate the point made.

50 This is the case at f. 6r9–10 (eyeskip between **vyāhārato* [**vyāharato* MS] in 6.1.8 and in 6.1.11; cf. footnotes 19 and 20 above) and at f. 6r13 (eyeskip—virtually haplography—between *chuci* in 6.2.7 and *aśuci* in 6.2.8; cf. p. 255 below). Note also the haplography of *anu* at f. 6r14 (7.1.17–18). The fact that these cases all occur on f. 6r may be indicative of a lapse in concentration of the scribe here; it does not weaken the point I seek to make.

the exemplar was of a similar type to our manuscript.

There is therefore good reason to think that this *sūtrapāṭha* recension has been transmitted as such, without a commentary, for at least two generations. Nothing can of course be said with certainty about the more distant ancestors of our manuscript. However, as mentioned above, I assume that this sūtra-only transmission, though it may go back some centuries, or even more perhaps, is not one which reaches back as far as the 'original' composition/compilation of the VS. For such a transmission, without even an oral commentary, would, as I see it, mean one in which the text was not studied, the nature of the sūtras being such that one cannot seriously conceive of them being seriously studied without a written or oral commentary or commentaries.

It may be worth recalling here the nature of the manuscript as a whole; first of all the fact that it originated among Jains and secondly the fact that it is one which contains several texts, beginning with that of the *Nyāyasūtra*.⁵¹ My speculation is that it may form part of a tradition of study of combined Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika by Jains, with the emphasis probably on Nyāya, given the order of texts. The sūtra-texts are placed at the beginning perhaps because of their acknowledged antiquity and the respect which was felt to be due to them, but the absence of the commentatorial literature suggests that they may not have been studied intensively. Obviously, however, it is reasonable to expect that the textual tradition must ultimately go back to a milieu of a different kind; i.e. that some ancestor of our manuscript was a codex in which a scholar who himself was not a 'specialist' copied or had copied for himself the text of the VS from a manuscript which had its origin in an environment of 'specialists,' and which was associated with a particular school of exegesis.

I now turn to an attempt to compare the sūtra text with that preserved in the three commentary versions.⁵² Such a comparison is not easy to carry out objectively, and is further complicated by the fact that, in my opinion, the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has in many places not been determined with certainty. In considering this, it should be remembered that I restrict myself to the portion for which all four recensions are available, i.e. up to and including 9.8 (9.1.7 in Thakur's edition of the abridged commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra) after which we no longer have any testimony to the readings known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra (cf. p. 204 above).

In the following I use these abbreviations: C = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by

51 'My thesis is that when we read an Old English literary text we should take care to find out what precedes it in its manuscript state and what follows it. . . . If a text is detached from its codicological environment (as texts normally are in our modern editions), we risk losing that part of its meaning' (Robinson 1994, 3). These remarks, though made by a specialist in a different field, are worth heeding by Indologists.

52 For a comparison with the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript see section 3.3.5.

Candrānada, BhV = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, ŚM = the *sūtrapāṭha* as commented on by Śaṃkara Miśra, A = the *sūtrapāṭha* reconstructed from the Ahmedabad manuscript as given in section 3.2.4 above, T = the *sūtrapāṭha* reconstructed from the Trivandrum manuscript as given in section 3.3.4 below.⁵³

I begin with a collection of instances where each recension is alone in including or omitting a sūtra; for the purpose of ascertaining the relationship between the recensions this type of variation (Greg's 'type 1') has of course rather little evidential value,⁵⁴ but it is clearly important to examine these cases.

- Sūtras found in A alone.⁵⁵

1. A 3.2.4 *prāṇac caikam*. In this case I think it probable that the sūtra has arisen as a result of corruption in transmission. The following sūtra begins *prāṇāpāna*^o and it is quite conceivable that after copying the first two *akṣaras* of this the eye of a scribe skipped back to the previous sūtra so that he continued with the concluding *akṣaras* of that, **c caikam*. Despite this very real possibility, I have hesitantly included the sūtra in the reconstruction as it seemed not wholly impossible to me that the corruption already existed in the hyparchetype—some sort of argument for the fact that each person has a single *manas* on the strength of the phenomenon of breath being conceivable.

- Sūtras found in C alone.

1. 5.2.4 *tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam*. Note that this is a reprise without variation of 5.2.2, which is found in all versions except BhV.

53 The latter is not referred to consistently: for a preliminary analysis of the variants it transmits see section 3.3.5 below.

54 Cf. Greg 1927, 21–22.

55 2.2.44 is not included in this list, not so much because it is also in T but because (*pace* Jambūvijaya et al.) I believe that it, as well as 2.2.45, does belong to Candrānada's *sūtrapāṭha* as well. Jambūvijaya prints *saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ* | 2.2.43 | *prathamāśabdaḥ sampratipattibhāvaś ceti sādṛśyād ete draṣṭavyāḥ* | (24.5–6). Note that J₁^f omits what Jambūvijaya takes as the sūtra here, but also omits the preceding *sandigdhaḥ satī bahuvī* 2.2.42 (cf. Jambūvijaya's notes 1 and 3 in the critical apparatus on p. 24). I propose *saṃkhyābhāvaḥ sāmānyataḥ prathamāśabdaḥ sampratipattibhāvaś ca* | 2.2.43 | *sādṛśyād ete draṣṭavyāḥ*, the *in* after the sūtra I would regard as not actually belonging to the text (cf. the remarks *apropos* of Candrānada's 1.1.29 on p. 191 above). The omission of 2.2.42 in J₁^f can now be explained as resulting from eyeskip between 2.2.41 (*sampratibhāvāc ca*) and the end of 2.2.43. One could also divide 2.2.43 into three sūtras, as I have done in A (and T), for reasons explained in the brief discussion *apropos* of 2.2.45 on p. 239 below, but Candrānada does not seem elsewhere to comment on a group of sūtras all together; note also that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's 2.2.40–41 are clearly taken as distinct sūtras by that commentator.

- Sūtras found in BhV alone.⁵⁶

1. 1.1.23 (1.1.24 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version) *tathā guṇāḥ*. Compare with 1.1.18⁵⁷ *tathā guṇaḥ*. The addition of this sūtra is in my opinion secondary, and reflects a historical development. Without it, the following sūtra would naturally be taken as an exhaustive listing of the qualities which may have more than one substance simultaneously as cause (i.e. as *samavāyikāraṇa*); although there are differences in the wording of the sūtra (A 1.1.23 ≈ C 1.1.23 ≈ BhV 1.1.24 [1.1.25 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary] ≈ ŚM 1.1.25) all versions list the same qualities: numbers from two upwards, separateness (i.e. 'multiple-separateness'), conjunction and disjunction. That even the other qualities, such as colour, are the common product of more than one substance (in that substances such as space, time and God can also be reckoned as their causes) is clearly an idea that is unlikely to be present in the earliest strata of Vaiśeṣika thought. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary is so interesting as to be worth quoting in full. *yathā dvyāṇukādidravyaṃ paramāṇudvayadikkāleśvarādīnām dravyāṇām samānam kāryam*⁵⁸ *tathā dvyāṇukādirūpādayo 'pi dvyāṇukādidikkāleśvarādīdravyāṇām samānam kāryam ity arthaḥ | ātreyaścāryās tu dvyāṇukādīnām ekaikadvyāṇukādidravyakāryatvānu-*

56 Note that the sūtras numbered 1.1.13 and 1.1.14 in Thakur's edition of the short version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary are not included in this listing because in my opinion they do not belong in the sūtra text at this point: they are probably to be seen as quotations in the commentary of 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. Similarly, 2.1.23 of Thakur's edition of the abridged version, *śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇa iti*, is correctly not printed as a sūtra in his edition of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary (TS 223.27–28). This passage seems to be one in which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra offers some brief comments in advance on the group of sūtras 2.1.24–26. At a few points the commentary seems to need emending, however: as printed the passage runs *arthāntaranirākaraṇapūrvakaṃ gaganagocaraṃ sāmānyatodṛṣṭaṃ vyutpādayati bhagavān sūtrakāraḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrvaka ityādinā — liṅgam ākāśasya ity anena tatra śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ | iti śabdaḥ | śabdo liṅgam ākāśasya || 2.2.26 || ity anenānvīyate*— (TS 223.26–30). I propose reading the passage between arrows as follows: *liṅgam ākāśasyaityantena | tatra śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ (2.2.26) iti | śabdaśabdo* (i.e. the word *śabda* in this sūtra) *liṅgam ākāśasya (2.1.30) ity anenānvīyate*; cf. in the abridged version *tatra śabdaśabdo liṅgam ity anenānvīyate* (23.5). In the edition of the abridged commentary there is also a significant correction that needs to be made: after the *śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇa iti* that is printed as a sūtra the manuscript has the word *vakṣyati*, a clear indication that this is not a sūtra that is meant to go here but a quotation of 2.2.26.

57 Numbered 1.1.19 only in ŚM and Thakur's edition of the abridged version of BhV's commentary.

58 Read thus with the edited text of the *Tarkasāgara* version: the abridged version as edited by Thakur has *samānakāryam*.

prints *aṇusaṃyogas* (47.1) where the manuscript has *āmasaṃyogas*, which should be restored.

3. 6.2.15 *etena dveṣo vyākhyātaḥ*. Cf. footnote 29 on p. 96 above.

- Sūtras found in ŚM alone.

1. 1.1.4 *dharmaviśeṣaprasūtād dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām padārthānām sādharṃyavaidharṃyābhyām tattvajñānān niḥśreyasam*. This sūtra has been discussed not infrequently, particularly in connection with the problem of the beginning of the VS.⁵⁹ and its resemblance with a sentence in the opening section of the PDhS, *dravyaguṇakarmasāmānyaviśeṣasamavāyānām ṣaṇṇām padārthānām sādharṃyavaidharṃyatattvajñānām niḥśreyasahetuḥ* (6.1–15), has been often remarked on. Here let me merely say that there is no good reason to regard the sūtra as old. For a different sūtra inserted in the same place in the recension represented by the Trivandrum manuscript see pp. 270 and 283 below.
2. 1.1.9 *dravyaguṇayoḥ sajātīyārambhakatvaṃ sādharṃyam*. This sūtra too is likely to be secondary—it expresses very explicitly what the following sūtras teach. This is recognized by Śaṅkara Miśra himself, who rather than commenting on the sūtra immediately introduces the next one (*dravyāṇi dravyam ārabhante guṇāś ca guṇāntaram*⁶⁰) with the words *etad eva sūtrāntareṇa spaṣṭayati* (28.11).
3. 1.1.12 *na dravyaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ ca vadhati*. This comes in the place of the sūtra *kāryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca* (cf. p. 238 below).

59 The last two sentences, from *ātreyaśāstrīyās tu*, are omitted in the abridged version of the commentary.

60 See especially Frauwallner 1984, Houben 1995, 714ff., and Isaacson 1995, 757–758.

61 Two sūtras in C and BhV.

7. 3.2.15 *devadatto gacchaīty upacārād abhimānāt tāvac charīrapratyakṣo* 'haṁkārah. Again the manuscript Trivandrum 5346 has a variant worth noting; it reads *abhimānāc charīrapratyakṣo* for *abhimānāt tāvac charīrapratyakṣo*. Although the word *tāvat* does occur in Śaṅkara Mīśra's commentary, it is by no means certain that it is a *pratīka* from the sūtra. The word *tāvat* does not occur elsewhere in the VS.
8. 3.2.16 *saṁdigdhas tūpacārah*. A repetition of A 3.2.13 (≈ C 3.2.12 ≈ BhV 3.2.11).
9. 3.2.18 *aham iti mukhyayogyābhyāṁ śabdavad vyatirekāvyabhicārād viśeṣasiddher nāgamikaḥ*. Note that the terms *mukhya* and *yogya* do not occur elsewhere in the VS.
10. 4.2.1 *tat punar pṛthivyādikāryadravyaṁ trividhaṁ śarīrendriyaviśayasamjñakam*. This improbable looking sūtra—the *punaḥ* seems inappropriate to the style of the sūtras, and indeed is not found elsewhere in the VS—is probably modelled directly or indirectly on a recurrent phrase in the PDhS; compare *trividhaṁ cāsyāḥ* (i.e. *pṛthivyāḥ*) *kāryam*, *śarīrendriyaviśayasamjñakam* (27.21–22), *tāsāṁ* (i.e. *apām*) *tu kāryaṁ trividhaṁ śarīrendriyaviśayasamjñakam* (36.3–4) and *kāryaṁ ca* (scil. *tejasāḥ*) *śarīrādītrayaṁ* (39.3). Note however that when it comes to *vāyu* Praśastapāda writes *tatra kāryalakṣaṇaś caturvidhaḥ*—*śarīram indriyaṁ viśayaḥ prāṇa iti* (44.6–7); this difference is not reflected either in the sūtra or Śaṅkara Mīśra's commentary thereon.

62 The Bibliotheca Indica edition prints *drṣṭayātmani* and this is retained by Nozawa in his comparative table, though he reports that 'other versions' (i.e. other editions of Śaṅkara Mīśra's commentary) have the reading *drṣṭa ātmani* or *drṣṭyātmani* (p. 82). *drṣṭa ātmani* is the reading in the text given by Gough (and incidentally also in the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript Wellcome α 301); what is more important, it is clearly supported by Śaṅkara Mīśra's commentary, which begins *drṣṭic pratyakṣeṇa gṛhīta ātmani liṅge* (178.12). Jambūvijaya also gives this as ŚM's reading.

11. 6.1.14 *hīne pare tyāgaḥ*. Perhaps added for symmetry; the following sūtras are *sama āmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā* 6.1.15 and *viśiṣṭa āmatyāgaḥ* 6.1.16 (no variants). But the preceding sūtra *viruddhānām tyāgaḥ* 6.1.13 (again no variants) should probably be interpreted, as Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra do, as referring to *hīnas*, and if this is the case 6.1.14 is redundant. The possibility that ŚM is 'original' here, and that the sūtra has been lost in all other versions as a result of eyeskip (caused by successive sūtras ending with *tyāgaḥ*) is in my view a very remote one.
12. 7.1.15 *karmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇaiś ca guṇā vyākhyātāḥ*. Though the content of this sūtra is hardly new, the other versions do not have it at this place,⁶³ and it is unusual in having the words *ca* and *vyākhyātāḥ* in it. Compare A's 7.1.25 (cf. p. 250 below).
13. 7.2.5 *bhrāntaṃ tat*. Perhaps interpolated from a commentary: the terminology *bhrāntaḥ/bhrānti* does not occur elsewhere in the VS, nor even in the PDhS.

• Sūtras omitted only in A.

1. C 2.1.21 ≈ BhV 2.1.21 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.20 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.21.
2. C 2.1.22 ≈ BhV 2.1.22 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.21 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.22.
3. C 2.1.23 ≈ BhV 2.1.23 (thus numbered in the edition of the long version; 2.1.22 in that of the abridged version) ≈ ŚM 2.1.23.

The omission of this group of sūtras has no obvious mechanical cause: taking their content into account, it seems an interesting and significant case. For it is in these sūtras that arguments are given against a view, put forward in 2.1.20, that holds going out and entering (*niṣkramaṇa* and *praveśana*) to be an inferential mark from which the existence of ether as a separate substance can be inferred. The following three sūtras, 2.1.24–26, put forward sound as an inferential mark serving the same purpose. Now considerations related to the question of the development of the way in which the Vaiśeṣika conceived of sound led Bronkhorst to conclude that all six sūtras, 2.1.21–26, have been 'added onto another, older inferential mark [i.e. that put forward in 2.1.20] meant to prove the existence of ether' (1993b, 81), though he

63 One could however regard it as having been 'moved,' and as corresponding to A 7.1.24–26 ≈ C 7.1.24 ≈ BhV 7.1.26–27.

also remarks that 2.1.26, which seems to be referred to by Bhartṛhari, 'appears to be old' (op. cit., 84). A's reading of the passage now appears to fit quite well with the assumption that Bronkhorst's theory is correct; it would seem then to preserve an earlier stage than any other version, one in which the older inferential mark was still accepted next to the more recently developed idea of sound as a quality that proves the existence of ether as its substratum.

4. C 4.1.8 \approx BhV 4.1.7 \approx ŚM 4.1.7. Note that homoeoteleuton may be involved (cf. the remark on C 4.1.7 on p. 241 below)
5. C 6.2.15 \approx BhV 6.2.14 \approx ŚM 6.2.12. One could also regard this sūtra, *adr̥ṣṭāt* in Candrānanda's text, *adr̥ṣṭāc ca* in that of the other two commentators, as having been telescoped with A 6.2.16 *adr̥ṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ*, for which C (6.2.16) and BhV (6.2.16) have *jātivīśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ* and ŚM (6.2.13) simply *jātivīśeṣaḥ*.

• Sūtras omitted only in C.

1. A 3.1.7 \approx BhV 3.1.9 \approx ŚM 3.1.8. This is a slightly dubious case; one manuscript (J₁^S, referred to as PS by Jambūvijaya) does have the sūtra (cf. the *vṛddhipatraka* of Jambūvijaya's edition, 228.13–229.3).
2. A 4.2.4 *tad ayonijam* \approx BhV 4.2.5 *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijam ca* \approx ŚM 4.2.5 *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijam ca*.

• Sūtras omitted only in BhV.⁶⁴

1. A 2.2.40 \approx C 2.2.40 \approx ŚM 2.2.34.
2. A 3.1.14 \approx C 3.1.12 \approx ŚM 3.1.16–17.
3. A 3.2.12 \approx C 3.2.11 \approx ŚM 3.2.12.
4. A 3.2.18 \approx C 3.2.17 \approx ŚM 3.2.21.
5. A 4.1.4 \approx C 4.1.4 \approx ŚM 4.1.4.
6. A 4.2.10 \approx C 4.2.9 \approx ŚM 4.2.10–11.
7. 5.1.2 (in all other versions).
8. 5.1.12 (in all other versions).

64 I suspect, without however being able to offer clinching arguments, that the omission of 2.2.7–8 (of all other versions) is due to error in transmission and does not go back to the hyparchetype of Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra's *sūtrapāṭha*; for this reason they are not included in the list below. Certainly there is nothing in their content or wording that would have been unacceptable to Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra. Note that the evidence of the long version of the commentary is unfortunately unavailable here, due to a lacuna in Thakur's transcript(s).

Ke

9. 5.2.2 (in all other versions).
10. A 5.2.8 \approx C 5.2.9 \approx ŚM 5.2.8.
11. A 5.2.14 \approx C 5.2.15 \approx ŚM 5.2.14.
- ✓ 12. A 5.2.21 \approx C 5.2.22 \approx ŚM 5.2.20.
13. A 5.2.25 \approx C 5.2.26 \approx ŚM 5.2.24.
14. A 6.1.11 \approx C 6.1.11 \approx ŚM 6.1.8.
15. A 6.2.11 \approx C 6.2.10 \approx ŚM 6.2.8.⁶⁵
16. A 6.2.14 \approx C 6.2.13 \approx ŚM 6.2.11.
17. A 6.2.17 \approx C 6.2.17 \approx ŚM 6.2.14.
18. A 7.2.21 \approx C 7.2.18 \approx ŚM 7.2.17.
19. A 8.1.5 \approx C 8.5 \approx ŚM 8.1.5.
20. A 9.2 \approx C 9.2 \approx ŚM 9.1.2.

• Sūtras omitted only in ŚM.

1. 1.1.11 (in all other versions but T, where it is 1.1.12) *kāryāvirodhi dra-
vyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca*. In place of this ŚM has its unique 1.1.12: cf.
p. 234 above.
2. 1.2.9 (in all other versions).⁶⁶
3. A 2.2.9 \approx C 2.2.9 \approx BhV 2.2.7⁶⁷
4. A 2.2.20 \approx C 2.2.20 \approx BhV 2.2.18.⁶⁸
5. A 2.2.32 \approx C 2.2.32 \approx BhV 2.2.34.⁶⁹
6. A 2.2.39 \approx C 2.2.39 \approx BhV 2.2.33.⁷⁰

⁶⁵ In ŚM this sūtra and A's 6.2.10 \approx C 6.2.9 are read together as a single sūtra.

⁶⁶ Though omitted in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṇṇa Vādindra's commentary, the sūtra is found as 1.2.9 in the full version (TS 187.1).

⁶⁷ This is the numbering in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; in his edition of the long version he numbers it 2.2.9, but note that the transcript(s) of the long version lack the opening of this *āhnika*.

⁶⁸ Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; 2.2.20 in his edition of the full version.

⁶⁹ Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the long version; lacking in the edition of the abridged version.

⁷⁰ Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the abridged version; 2.2.39 in his edition of the long version.

7. A 2.2.45 \approx C 2.2.45⁷¹ \approx BhV 2.2.42. Note that it would be possible to take this sūtra with the preceding one (or two) as a single sūtra. However, I have chosen to divide thus, in accordance with the fact that 2.2.39–41 appear to be separate sūtras in all recensions, and 2.2.43–45 mirror the earlier group, with nominatives replacing the ablatives; the facts adduced by an opponent to prove that sound/word is eternal can all be explained simple *sāmānyataḥ* (2.2.43).
8. A 4.2.7 \approx C 4.2.6 \approx BhV 4.2.8.
9. A 5.2.17 \approx C 5.2.18 \approx BhV 5.2.16.
10. 6.1.2 (in all other versions).
11. 6.1.6 (in all other versions).
12. 6.1.8 (in all other versions).
13. A 6.2.15 \approx C 6.2.14 \approx BhV 6.2.13.
14. 7.1.2 (in all other versions).
15. 7.1.3 (in all other versions).
16. 7.1.6 (in all other versions).
17. A 7.1.11 \approx C 7.1.11 \approx BhV 7.1.12–13.
18. A 7.1.12 \approx C 7.1.12 \approx BhV 7.1.14.
19. A 7.1.13 \approx C 7.1.13 \approx BhV 7.1.15.
20. A 7.1.24 \approx C 7.1.24 \approx BhV 7.1.26.
21. A 7.1.25 \approx C 7.1.24⁷² \approx BhV 7.1.27.
22. A 7.2.3 \approx C 7.2.2 \approx BhV 7.2.3.
23. A 7.2.4 \approx C 7.2.3 \approx BhV 7.2.4.
24. A 7.2.6 \approx C 7.2.5 \approx BhV 7.2.6.
25. A 7.2.7 \approx C 7.2.5⁷³ \approx BhV 7.2.7.
26. A 7.2.25 \approx C 7.2.22 \approx BhV 7.2.23.
27. A 7.2.26 \approx C 7.2.23 \approx BhV 7.2.24.

71 Absent in Jambūvijaya's edition, but I believe it belongs in Candrānanda's *sūtrapāṭha*: cf. footnote 55 on p. 232 above. If I am mistaken in this, this sūtra would fall under the heading of sūtras found in A and BhV but omitted in C and ŚM. T also testifies to the presence of the sūtra.

72 Note that what in BhV is two sūtras (7.1.26–27) is a single sūtra in C, and that the decision to take as two sūtras in A is a fairly arbitrary one.

73 Again, what in BhV is two sūtras (7.2.6–7) is a single sūtra in C, and the decision to take as two sūtras in A is more or less an arbitrary one.

28. A 8.1.12 \approx C 8.11 \approx BhV 8.1.11.⁷⁴

From the data presented above it may be seen that all forms of type 1 variants are to be found, as was no doubt to be expected. What immediately catches the eye, however, is the fact that BhV and ŚM are so much more often alone in inclusion and especially omission of sūtras than the other two recensions are. Most, though perhaps not all, of these isolated readings are probably secondary, but the significance of this is perhaps different in the two cases. In that of ŚM the text commented on by Śaṅkara Miśra has probably been established with a fair degree of accuracy, and the errors belong to the hyparchetype. In that of BhV, however, I have strong suspicions that the deterioration largely post-dates the composition of the commentary, in other words that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra himself had a *sūtrapāṭha* with fewer unique readings (especially omissions) than would appear from the text as we now have it. This is supported by the fact that the publication of the full version of the commentary already allows us to see that the text of the first two *adhyāyas* known to him was less deviant than it appeared when all that we had to go on was Thakur's edition of the abridged version.

Next let us look at variants of type 2, i.e. agreements between two sources, on the level of inclusion and omission of sūtras.

- Sūtras found in A and C, but lacking in BhV and ŚM.
 1. A 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyam guṇaḥ karmaṇi saṁśayaḥ* \approx C 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyam karma guṇa itī saṁśayaḥ*.⁷⁵ The word-order in A is a little more natural than in C.
 2. A 2.2.33 *śabdavyaṅjaka abhāvāt* \approx C 2.2.33 *abhāvāt*. Cf. p. 244 below.
- Sūtras found in A and BhV but lacking in C and ŚM. No cases found.
- Sūtras found in A and ŚM but lacking in C and BhV. No cases found.
- Sūtras found in C and BhV but lacking in A and ŚM.
 1. C 4.1.7 *adravyavattvāt paramāṇāv anupalabdhiḥ* \approx BhV 4.1.6 (same reading).⁷⁶ In this case, it must be considered a possibility that this sūtra

74 Not recognized as a sūtra by Thakur, but following after the sūtra which he numbers 77.1 in his edition of the abridged version (77.1).

75 Nozawa tentatively suggests that *kim ayam dravyam guṇa karma veti* in the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary (31.16) may correspond to this. However it seems, also from the text of the full version of the commentary, though that is partly damaged here, that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra did not have a corresponding sūtra (see TS 246.23–29 and Thakur's footnote on this page).

76 On the reading known to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra see footnote 45 on p. 113 above.

as well as the following one (C 4.1.8 \approx Bh 4.1.7 \approx ŚM 4.1.7) has been lost in A and/or ŚM due to eyeskip provoked by homoeoteleuton, as there is a series of sūtras starting from C's 4.1.6 and running through C's 4.1.9 which all end with °*palabdhiḥ*. On the other hand, perhaps the sūtra may have been interpolated; note above all that it is the only sūtra in any version of the VS to contain the word *paramāṇu* (see for further discussion Isaacson 1990, 33–34).

- Sūtras found in C and ŚM but lacking in A and BhV.

1. C 4.1.9 *anekadravyeṇa dravyeṇa samavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc copalabdhiḥ* \approx ŚM 4.1.8 *anekadravyasamavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ*. Again, homoeoteleuton must be reckoned with, as with C's 4.1.7 (see above).

- Sūtras found in BhV and ŚM but lacking in A and C. No instances found.

The number of cases involved is so small that these data must of course be treated very cautiously, but the first impression from this is that A is most closely related to C.

Before moving to the consideration of some individual readings the question of organization of the sūtras should perhaps briefly be mentioned. The point of interest concerns the last three *adhyāyas*. While all recensions agree in dividing the first 7 *adhyāyas* into two *āhnikas*, and agree also in where these *adhyāyas* are to be divided, they all differ with respect to the organization of *adhyāyas* 8–10. Candrānanda does not divide them at all, and in this he is supported by the brief summary of the VS given in Mādhava's *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* (85.12–86.2). Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and Śaṅkara Miśra divide the eighth and ninth *adhyāyas* into two *āhnikas*, but differ in both cases as to the point of division. Our manuscript also divides the eighth *adhyāya*, but at another point yet, while it has no such division of the ninth. For the tenth *adhyāya* we have no evidence as to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's text, but, as in the ninth, ŚM has two *āhnikas*. The Ahmedabad manuscript this time also divides, but, as in the eighth *adhyāya*, at a different place from ŚM. In this case, in fact, the division seems a particularly unequal one, with the second *āhnika* being reduced to only two sūtras—the two reprises of earlier sūtras with which the VS ends: *drṣṭānām drṣṭaprayojanānām drṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya* (no variants) occurs earlier as 6.2.1, while the final sūtra *tadvacanād āmnāyapramāṇyam* (ŚM alone reads *tadvacanād āmnāyasya pramāṇyam*) is VS 1.1.3.

This points again to the independence of A from the other recensions, and it could be argued that once more the evidence suggests that it is C to which A is closest, in as much as at least in the case of the ninth *adhyāya* the two agree in having

no division in *āhnikas*. Incidentally, the fact that all versions which do divide any of these last *adhyāyas* do so in different places is strong support for the assumption that any such division is a secondary attempt to make these *adhyāyas* conform in their outward organization to *adhyāyas* 1–7.

In dealing, as we shall now attempt to, with variants in the readings of sūtras, the practical and methodological difficulties involved increase considerably. First of all, the poor quality of both transmission and edition of both versions of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary causes problems which cannot be resolved at present, and this therefore risks distorting our results. When looking at the finer level of wording, this risk is even greater than when the inclusion or omission of sūtras is the basis of comparison. In addition, if one tries for example to count agreements and disagreements between recensions, one must be aware of the extent to which figures which give the impression of exactness are in fact influenced by choices which are partly arbitrary, in particular the choice of variation-units:⁷⁷ thus if one chooses to count once each *akṣara* that differs, the numbers produced will be markedly different from those resulting from a count based on the number of words which vary or one which takes the sūtra as the basic unit, as I shall do in the following.

For these reasons, it is best not to accord much weight to the precise number of cases of each type of variation listed in the pages that follow. I begin with a collection of those sūtras where A differs from all three commentary-recensions, with some brief comment being given in most cases. After that the sūtras where A agrees in reading with each recension alone are collected. In the case of BhV, however, only those cases are taken up in the list where I feel that the reading accepted by Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra has been established with a strong degree of certainty. Similarly, it must be born in mind that some cases where A seems to agree with C alone are not listed as such because I believe that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, despite the reading ascribed to him in Thakur's edition(s), also had the same text.

These caveats having been given, let us look at the data. As before, I restrict myself to the portion of the VS for which the testimony of all three commentaries is available, i.e. up to A 9.8.

• Sūtras in which A's readings are unique.⁷⁸

1. 1.1.14 *kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇaṃ dravyam iti dravyalakṣaṇam*.
All other versions omit *dravyam*, in which case the structure of the sūtra

77 One is surprised how often this methodological point is left unmentioned by those whom it affects most: those who in classifying manuscripts and drawing up a *stemma codicum* rely heavily on statistics of patterns of agreement.

78 Some of these readings are in fact shared with the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript treated in the following section (T): for a list of these see p. 298f. below.

is more closely parallel to the following sūtras which give the *lakṣaṇa* of quality and motion. The variant may go back to the hyparchetype, but with no further support for it, there is no reason to think it original.

2. 1.1.24 *asamavāyāt sāmānyam kāryam karma na vidyate*. The difference with the other recensions, none of which agree, is fairly trivial: C has *asamavāyāt sāmānyam karma kāryam na vidyate*, BhV *asamavāyāt kāryam karma na vidyate* and ŚM *asamavāyāt sāmānyakāryam karma na vidyate*.
3. 1.2.9 *ekadravyatvān na dravyam*. C and possibly BhV⁷⁹ read *ekadravyatvān na dravyam*. ŚM omits. A's reading is perfectly possible and is most unlikely to be an error by the scribe, as A appears always to use the terms *adravyatva*,⁸⁰ *ekadravyatva*⁸¹ and *anekadravyatva*⁸² instead of *adravyavattva* and so on. Unlike the versions we have with a commentary, A is consistent in this respect.⁸³ One explanation of this fact would be to take this as a sign of activity by a redactor who deliberately wished to remove inconsistencies which might perhaps be 'original,' and could even be in some cases an indication of different layers of composition. But I am not sure if this is the case—for one thing the commentators do not agree with each other in the reading of all these sūtras, and furthermore it could be argued that the addition of a *vat* in some cases may have been a secondary attempt to remove an ambiguity. The addition does not affect the sense, for all of these compounds are to be taken as bahuvrīhi adjectives.
4. 1.2.12 *ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam*. The versions of the com-

79 Thakur's edition of the short version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary does not have the sūtra as such, but Jambūvijaya, who is followed in this by Nozawa, takes the *tenaikadravyavṛttivād ākāśakāladigāmmāśritavād ity arthaḥ* printed as part of the commentary to 1.2.8 (16.11–12) as an indication that the corresponding sūtra in BhV should read *ekadravyavṛttivān na dravyam*. In the *Tarkasāgara* Thakur prints as a sūtra numbered 1.2.9 *ekadravya[vṛttivān] sattā na dravyam*: the use of square brackets may be taken as an indication that the transcript(s) used by him are corrupt or otherwise defective here. The commentary however includes, corresponding to the fragment of the abridged commentary quoted above, *tenaikadravyavṛttivād ity ākāśāśritavāt, kālāśritavāt, digāśritavāt, dravyavṛttivāntarajātirahitāśritavāt, ākāśādiguṇavad itī sūtrārthaḥ* (TS 187.17–19), and—rightly or wrongly—I place a little more reliance on this than on the transmission of the abridged commentary.

80 2.1.11 (see p. 244 below) and 2.1.13 (see p. 255 below).

81 1.2.12 (cf. below), 2.2.27 (here agreeing with BhV and ŚM, with only C reading *ekadravyavṛttivān na dravyam*) and 7.1.14.

82 4.1.6: see p. 247 below.

83 This consistency is also found in the *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript discussed in the following section (T).

mentators have *ekadravyavattvena* for *ekadravyatvena*. See the discussion apropos of 1.2.9 above.

5. 2.1.11 *adravyatvād dravyam*. C and BhV have *adravyavattvād* for *adravyatvād*, whereas ŚM reads *adravyavattvena*. Again I refer the reader to the remarks made on p. 243 above apropos of 1.2.9.
6. 2.1.12 *kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ceti*. The versions followed by the commentators⁸⁴ have *ca* for *ceti*. Since there is no obvious reason for the *iti* to have been secondarily added—it does not precede a colophon—I have retained it in the reconstruction; it is possible that it goes back to the hyparchetype, although I am not sure what function it would have had there. It may however be possible that the *iti* is a trace of the original process of extracting the sūtras from a commentary, i.e. that an *iti* with which the commentator had quoted the sūtra was mistaken as belonging to the *mūla*-text.
7. 2.1.20 *niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgatvāt*. All other versions read *liṅgam* for *liṅgatvāt*. I am not sure how the ablative is to be interpreted, if it is hyparchetypal.
8. 2.2.10 *nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt*. The *ca* is omitted in the versions of all the commentators. It is likely to be secondary; a syntactical tag added to make the structure of the sūtra clear and unambiguous.
9. 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmaṇi saṃśayaḥ*. For *guṇaḥ karmaṇi* C reads *karma guṇa iti*; the other two commentaries do not have the sūtra. Cf. p. 240 above.
10. 2.2.33 *śabdavyaṅjaka abhāvāt*. C has merely *abhāvāt*; the other commentators omit the sūtra. As being more explicit, A's reading may be secondary, perhaps originating from a commentary. This does not however seem to have been Candrānanda's, although the word *vyāṅjaka* does occur here in his commentary, or, more precisely, in the words which introduce the following sūtra.⁸⁵ Interestingly, A's variant is here supported by the Trivandrum *sūtrapāṭha* manuscript; see p. 292 below.
11. 3.1.2 *indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntare hetuḥ*. C and BhV⁸⁶ have *'rthāntaratve* and ŚM *'rthāntarasya* for *'rthāntare*, which however seems syntactically perfectly possible.

84 Though lacking in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's commentary, the sūtra can be found in the full version, numbered 2.1.12 in Thakur's edition (TS 218.1).

85 The commentary runs *prāgabhāvād ity arthaḥ | prāgabhāvavato vinnāśāt | prāgabhāvato nitya kā-rarebhyo utpatteḥ | na ca tāni vyaṅjakāni | kutaḥ*—22.14.

86 As I have remarked elsewhere (Isaacson 1995, 773–774), the reading given in Thakur's edition

12. 3.1.4 *kāraṇānām ajñānāt*. All other versions read a compound *kāraṇā-jñānāt*, which makes the sūtra parallel the following one, *kāryājñānāt* in all versions except ŚM which has *kāryeṣu jñānāt*, more closely. A's reading is doubtless secondary, but conceivably hyparchetypal.
13. 3.1.12 *prasiddho 'padeśaḥ*. All other versions⁸⁷ have two negatives, *aprasiddho 'napadeśaḥ*.
14. 3.1.14 *viśāṇī tasmād aśvo viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti*. C adds *ca* at the end of the sūtra, BhV does not have it (cf. p. 237 above), and ŚM splits into two sūtras reading *yasmād viśāṇī tasmād aśvaḥ* 3.1.16, *yasmād viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti cānaikāntikasyodāharaṇam* 3.1.17.
15. 3.1.16 *pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra līngam*. All the commentators read a *ca* after *pravṛttinivṛttī*.
16. 3.2.3 *prayatnajñānāyugapadyāc caikam*. BhV and C read *prayatnāyugapadyāj jñānāyugapadyāc caikam manah*, ŚM reads as they do but omitting the *manah*.⁸⁸ The *manah* could be regarded as over-explicit, as without it it is clear enough what the subject is from 3.2.1. As for the other variant, it is interesting to note that Praśastapāda refers to the sūtra as authority for the fact that there is only one *manah* per person with the word *prayatnajñānāyugapadyavacanāt pratiśarīram ekatvaṃ siddham* (89.13–14), though one should no doubt be cautious in drawing conclusions when a sūtra is referred to in this slightly loose fashion, obviously not a direct quotation. Of the commentators on this PDhS passage, only Udayana quotes the sūtra with the compound, in the form *prayatnajñānāyugapadyād ekam manah* (KĀ 102.2). Udayana's reading is thus anomalous; perhaps he is quoting from memory here.
17. 3.2.10 *nāham iti śabdavyatirekāt*. C *aham iti śabdavyatirekām nāgamikam*, BhV *aham iti śabdavyatirekeṇa nāgamikam*, ŚM *aham iti śabdasya vyatirekām nāgamikam*. A's reading conveys the same sense as

of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary must be corrected on two points: for *indriyārthaprasiddher* read *indriyārthaprasiddhir* and for *'rthāntare* read *'rthāntaratve*. As to the former point, the arguments I adduced before may be supplemented by a further one; from the *idam evottaram* with which the commentary on 3.2.2 ends (or rather with which 3.2.3 is introduced) it may be concluded that actually 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 are supposed to be the same sūtra, which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra wishes us to read (partly at least) twice, by *āvṛtti*. And 3.2.2, as printed by Thakur, runs *indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyaḥ*. Obviously the entire passage as edited needs considerable revision.

⁸⁷ In ŚM the sūtra is combined into one with the following *asan sandigdhas cānapadeśaḥ*.

⁸⁸ Thus the editions and Wellcome α 301, but Trivandrum 5346 does have the word. Śaṅkara Miśra's commentary does not allow the point to be settled.

the other versions, but may be a secondary attempt to be more brief. Note that there are no other sūtras with the same structure of a negation followed by an argument for the negation expressed by a noun in the ablative case.⁸⁹

18. 3.2.11 *yadi ca pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti*. All versions differ, C having *yadi ca dr̥ṣṭaprat yakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti*, BhV *yadi ca draṣṭuḥ pratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadattaḥ* and ŚM *yadi dr̥ṣṭam anvakṣam ahaṃ devadatto 'haṃ yajñadatta iti*. Here it seems possible that both BhV and ŚM have corruptions of the reading found in C,⁹⁰ so perhaps A's reading is also secondary—it could either have arisen involuntarily or be an 'improvement,' as the compound *dr̥ṣṭapratyakṣa* may well have been felt to be somewhat awkward and pleonastic. But perhaps it cannot be wholly ruled out that A preserves an original reading here, for the compound in C could be an admittedly somewhat clumsy attempt to be more explicit, or the result of incorporation of a marginal gloss. This latter possibility must however be for the time being regarded as a remote one, as it implies a relationship between C, BhV and ŚM for which other evidence seems to be lacking.
19. 3.2.12 *devadatto gacchatīti viṣṇumitro gacchatīti copacārūc charīrapratyakṣaḥ*. For the first *gacchatīti* C has merely *gacchati*. BhV omits.⁹¹ ŚM *devadatto gacchati yajñadatto gacchatīty upacārūc charīre pratyayaḥ*.
20. 3.2.17 *nānāvasthātaḥ*. C has *nānā vyavasthātaḥ* and ŚM *vyavasthāto nānā*, while the equivalent words in BhV are joined with the preceding sūtra, which then reads *sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikāntīye na vyavasthā*. A's reading may go back to that found in C, but it seems possible that the divergence, if the direction of change is indeed this way, was already present in the hyparchetype.

89 This holds at least for the *sūtrapāṭha* versions of C and A. BhV alone reads 6.2.13 (A's 6.2.15) *na tṛpteh* (the others omit the *na*), and ŚM alone reads 2.2.24 (A's 2.2.25) *nāpi karmānūṣṭhānītvāt*. It is possible that the same syntactical structure occurs in a sūtra found in T alone, but the reading, interpretation and even division is uncertain: see p. 285 below.

90 Unlike Honda (1993, 294), I do not find BhV's reading confidence-inspiring. C's reading is by no means easy to interpret, but as shown by Oetke (1988, 325–331) it need not be taken as Candrānanda understands it, and it may well be original.

91 Jambūvijaya (1961, 110) apparently thinks that the sūtra should be added to the BhV *sūtrapāṭha*, but it is not found in the manuscript, and I see no certain signs in the commentary that it was known to Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra, though as almost always it is possible that a mishap has occurred in the process of abridgement or transmission.

21. 4.1.6 *mahary anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ*. All the commentators read *anekadravyavattvād* for *anekadravyatvād*. Cf. the remarks apropos of 1.2.9 on p. 243 above.
22. 4.1.11 *etena guṇatve bhāve ca sārvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam*. For *sārvendriyajñānaṃ* C reads *sarvendriyajñānaṃ* and BhV and ŚM *sarvendriyaṃ jñānaṃ*. Note however that manuscript J₁ of Candrānanda's commentary on the VS has *sārveṇḍriyajñānaṃ*, agreeing with A.
23. 4.2.2 *guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca dvyātmakam api na*. C reads *tryātmakam* for *dvyātmakam*, ŚM reads *na tryātmakam* for *dvyātmakam api na* and BhV apparently reads *dvyātmakam tryātmakam api*.⁹²
24. 4.2.3 *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām*. C as edited by Jambūvijaya reads *avipratiṣiddho* for *apratīṣiddho*, but note that the Śāradā manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary have *ātmasaṃyogas tu pratiṣiddho* which is probably a misreading for *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho* as in A. BhV reads *ātmasaṃyogaś ca pratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām* and follows this with, it appears, another sūtra reading *ātmasaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddho mithaḥ pañcānām* (cf. p. 234 above). ŚM is printed as reading *aṇusaṃyogas tv apratiṣiddhaḥ* but the words *mithaḥ pañcānām* at the conclusion of this are found in both Trivandrum 5346 and Wellcome α301, and, as was pointed out more than half a century ago by Kaviraj (1929, 74), Śaṅkara Miśra's commentary suggests that he indeed had them in his text.
25. 4.2.4 *tad ayonijam*. C does not have the sūtra; BhV reads *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijam ca* and ŚM *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijam ayonijam ca*. A has certainly the *lectio brevior (et difficilior)*; it is conceivable that it underlies the explicitly developed sūtras of BhV and ŚM. Whatever its reading, the sūtra is not beyond suspicion; there is no apparent reason for its being left out in C if it is original. It is also omitted in T; see the brief discussion on p. 289 below.
26. 5.1.1 *ātmaprayatnasāṃyogābhyāṃ haste karma*. All the commentators have *ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ* for *ātmaprayatnasāṃyogābhyāṃ*. In favour of A's order one could adduce A 1.1.27 ≈ C 1.1.27 ≈ BhV 1.1.28⁹³ ≈ ŚM 1.1.29 *gurutvaprayatnasāṃyogānām utkṣepaṇam* (no

92 Thus the MS: *tryātmakam api [na]* in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, accepted by Jambūvijaya and Nozawa.

93 Thus numbered in Thakur's edition of the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary: 1.1.29 in his edition of the abridged version.

variants), while the other word-order could be defended on the basis of the fact that in the list of qualities in 1.1.5 (1.1.6 in ŚM alone) all versions have *saṃyoga* as the eighth and *prayatna* as the seventeenth item.

27. 5.1.17 *nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma tatkāritāc cottaraṃ tathottaram uttaraṃ ca*. For *tatkāritāc cottaraṃ* C has *karmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaraṃ* and BhV and ŚM *tatkarmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaraṃ*. There is no obvious cause for eyeskip here, and A's reading is clearly the least explicit, so it is conceivable that the commentators all have a text which is an attempt to clarify it.
28. 5.2.1 *nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāt pṛthivyām karma*. For *nodanābhighātāt* C reads *nodanād abhighātāt*; all commentators read *saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca* for *saṃyuktasaṃyogāt*.
29. 5.2.11 *apāṃ saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca*. C and BhV add *stanayitnuḥ* and ŚM adds *stanayitnoḥ* at the end.
30. 5.2.15–16 are best treated together, especially since the decision of how to divide into sūtras was partly an arbitrary one. *ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe* 5.2.15, *tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.16. C *ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe tadanārambhaḥ* 5.2.16. *ātmasthe manasi saśarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ sa yogaḥ* 5.2.17; BhV [*ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe*]⁹⁴ 5.2.12, *tadanārambhaś cātmasthe manasi*⁹⁵ 5.2.13, *saśarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvaḥ* 5.2.14, *saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.15; ŚM *ātmendriyamanorthasannikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe* 5.2.15, *tadanārambhaś cātmasthamanasi śarīrasya duḥkhābhāvaḥ saṃyogaḥ* 5.2.16. A's readings are not particularly good here, sharing *śarīrasya* with ŚM alone and reading *saṃyogaḥ* with BhV and ŚM against C's *sa yogaḥ*; Wezler's study of these sūtras concluded that both these readings are secondary as compared with Candrānanda's text (Wezler 1982a, 650–663).
31. 5.2.19 *dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād bhāsa abhāvas tamaḥ*.

94 This sūtra is lacking in the manuscript and has been supplied by Thakur on the basis of the commentary and ŚM's *sūtrapāṭha*.

95 Jambūvijaya already corrected the text to read thus, from the *cāmartha* manuscript of Thakur's edition, and Wezler (1982a, 680 n. 63) remarked that the commentary clearly supports this reading. Nozawa retains Thakur's reading, thus, as often, forming a step backward rather than forward. It can now be reported that the manuscript indeed has the correct *cāmartha* manuscript. No doubt Thakur 'corrected' this, as he so often does, to agree with ŚM; this would be less reprehensible a procedure had it not been carried out silently.

- C reads *dravyaguṇakarmavaidharmyād bhāvābhāvamātram tamaḥ*, BhV is closest to A, differing only in having *bhābhāvas* for *bhāsa abhāvas*,⁹⁶ and ŚM has *abhāvas* instead.
32. 5.2.20 *tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca tamaḥ*. All other versions omit *tamaḥ*, taking the word as still applying through *anuvṛtti* from (A's) 5.2.19. The more explicit reading of A is thus likely to be secondary.
33. 6.1.1 *buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vedaḥ*. Though this reading is also found in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary, I have there felt it necessary to emend *vedaḥ* to *vede*, as in the other commentators' text. In itself, however, the reading *vedaḥ* seems not impossible. See the discussion in footnote 3 on p. 78 above.
34. 6.1.3 *tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarma siddhiliṅgam*. C has °*siddhir liṅgam*, while BhV and ŚM agree with A on this point but omit *tathā*.
35. 6.1.6 *tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām*. For *tayos tu* C has *tayoḥ* and BhV *tayoś ca*; ŚM does not have the sūtra. The fact that A has a different particle from BhV may be seen as confirmation that C's reading is the oldest; it has been 'elaborated' differently in A and BhV.
36. 6.1.11 *tatsamabhivyaḥārato doṣaḥ*. For *tatsamabhivyaḥārato* C has simply *samabhivyaḥārato* and ŚM *tasya samabhivyaḥārato*; the sūtra is not found in BhV. C's reading is likely to be once more the source of the other two, more explicit ones.
37. 6.2.11 *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya*. C has *cānarthāntaratvād* for *cārthāntaratvād*. BhV omits the sūtra and ŚM, who as just remarked reads this together with the previous sūtra, has *vārthāntaratvād* instead of *cārthāntaratvād*. The interpretation of the entire passage is most difficult—there is no unanimity among the commentators. For a few remarks from which the complexity of the problem may at least be gathered see the comments on T's 6.2.13–14 on pp. 284ff. below.
38. 6.2.16 *adr̥ṣṭaviśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ*. C and BhV have *jātivīśeṣāc ca rāgaviśeṣaḥ* and ŚM simply *jātivīśeṣāc ca*. As remarked above (p. 237) it is possible that two sūtras have been telescoped as a result of post-hyparchetype corruption, but the error, if it is that, may also have existed in the hyparchetype, as the sūtra can be interpreted well enough as transmitted.

96 Thus the manuscript, and the commentary clearly supports the reading. Unfortunately, although he realized and even remarked on this fact (see page 9 of his English introduction), Thakur printed *abhāvas*, giving too much weight to ŚM, and Jambūvijaya and Nozawa have retained this.

39. 7.1.17 *viparītam aṇu*. C and BhV read *tadviparītam aṇu* and ŚM *ato viparītam aṇu*. As the least explicit reading, it is possible that *viparītam aṇu* is the most original form, which has been amplified independently in the texts of the commentators.
40. 7.1.18 *aṇu mahad iti ekasmin viśeṣābhāvād viśeṣabhāvāc ca*. For *ekasmin* all other versions have *tasmin*, which the commentators understand as meaning 'with regard to a [single] object,' i.e., *de facto*, *ekasmin*. A's reading is therefore most likely secondary, as an unsupported *lectio faciliior*, but it is perfectly possible that it was present in the hyparchetype (if it is not a variant that arose under the influence of the hypothetical commentary accompanying the hyparchetype).
41. 7.1.25 *guṇaiś ca guṇāḥ*. All other versions⁹⁷ have simply *guṇair* for *guṇaiś ca*, and this is also A's reading at 7.2.7, 7.2.16 and 7.2.32. The reading may however be hyparchetypal; it is worth noting that ŚM's 7.1.15 (for which the other versions have no equivalent at the same place) reads *karmabhiḥ karmāṇi guṇaiś ca guṇā vyākhyātāḥ* (cf. p. 236 above).
42. 7.2.21 *asati nāstīti prayogāt*. C and ŚM—BhV appears not to have the sūtra—both add *ca* before *prayogāt*.
43. 7.2.26 *sambandhisambandhād iti cet saṁdehaḥ*. C reads *sambaddha-sambandhād* for *sambandhisambandhād*, BhV probably omits the word (see discussion in footnote 51 on p. 133 above) and ŚM omits the entire sūtra. A's reading seems intrinsically possible; it can be interpreted to mean the same as the C reading.
44. 7.2.29 *kāraṇaparatvāt kāraṇātvāc paratvāparatve*. All the commentators omit *paratvāparatve*. A's reading may go back to the hyparchetype, but is doubtless secondary (unnecessarily explicit) in comparison with the text of the commentators. It is however shared with T (cf. p. 299 below).
45. 8.1.4 *guṇakarmasv asaṁnivṛtteṣu jñānanīṣpatter dravyaṁ kāraṇaṁ kāraṇakāraṇaṁ ca*. For *guṇakarmasv asaṁnivṛtteṣu* Candrānanda and BhV⁹⁸ read *guṇakarmasv asaṁnikṛṣṭeṣu* and ŚM *guṇakarmasu saṁnikṛṣṭeṣu*. I have argued elsewhere that Candrānanda's reading is the oldest form of this sūtra (cf. Isaacson 1990, 46–47);⁹⁹ A is interesting

97 Note that Candrānanda treats this together with the preceding sūtra as a single sūtra.

98 Not in the edition by Thakur, who has once more silently 'corrected' to agree with ŚM, but in the manuscript.

99 A different opinion is expressed by Nozawa (1993b, 1156(7)–1155(8)), but I find his arguments

here both in retaining the negative *a* lost in BhV and ŚM and in that its reading may attest to another—admittedly unconvincing—solution found of the exegetical difficulty which the development in the notion of *saṃnikarṣa* and Vaiśeṣika ontology created. One can imagine that our hypothetical commentator explained *asaṃnivṛtteṣu* as meaning ‘while [the qualities and actions] have not [yet] been destroyed.’ No occurrences of *saṃni√vṛt* are to be found in any version of the VS.

46. 8.1.9 *samavāyinaḥ śvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kārya-kāraṇabhūte iti*. None of the other versions has the concluding *iti*; BhV reads *chvaityabuddheḥ ca* for *chvaityabuddheḥ* and ŚM *te ete* for *ete*.
47. 8.1.12 *guṇakarmasu ca kāraṇāviśeṣāt*. C reads *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇāviśeṣāt* and BhV *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇāviśeṣāt*,¹⁰⁰ ŚM omits. A’s omission of *tathā dravya*^o may well belong to the hyparchetype; not only is there no obvious cause for mechanical omission but the sūtra thus forms a clear parallel to 8.1.10–11. Those sūtras (or that sūtra—it is a moot point whether to divide or not) apparently teach that cognitions of substances which are not related as qualifier and qualified do not cause each other. It then might seem superficially at least smoother to continue with a sūtra arguing that this applies too to cognitions of qualities and motions (which cannot be thus related) rather than one which again refers to cognitions of substances as well as of qualities and motions.
48. 8.2.3 *tathāpas tejo vāyus ca rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*. For *rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt* C reads *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*, BhV *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu* (with *rasarūpasparśāt* as a separate sūtra)¹⁰¹ and ŚM *rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*. A’s reading, unsupported, seems unlikely to be original, but the *rasanādiṣu* is an interesting *lectio faciliior*; Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra agree that the expression *gandhajñāna* in the previous sūtra¹⁰² and the *rasarūpasparśajñāna* they have here are used in fact in the sense of the

unconvincing while those which I adduced in 1990 still seem to me to be valid and could now, I believe, be supplemented with still others that point in the same direction, though I reserve a fresh discussion for another occasion. Let me just say that, considering all the recensions now available and their readings, it is not even the case that the reading *guṇakarmasu sannikṛteṣu jñānanīṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇakāraṇaṃ ca*, which Nozawa prefers, is as he claims ‘the majority reading’ (1993b, 1155(8)).

100 Thus correctly Jambūvijaya, followed by Nozawa. Thakur did not print this as a sūtra.

101 Accepting the reading and division proposed by Jambūvijaya and Nozawa.

102 Śaṃkara Miśra also has *gandhajñāna* in that sūtra, 8.2.5 in his *sūtrapāṭha*, and he too explains the word as *gandho jñāyate ‘neneti gandhajñānaṃ ghrāṇam* (371.3).

corresponding sense-organ.¹⁰³

49. 9.5. *yac cānyat satas tad asat*. C and BhV *yac cānyat satas tad apy asat*, ŚM *yac cānyad asat atas tad asat*.¹⁰⁴ Not much weight can be attached to this case, as the reading given for A here is little more than a guess; the manuscript is hopelessly corrupt at this point.

• Sūtras in which A agrees with C against BhV and ŚM.

1. 2.1.6 *sarpirjatumadhūcchiṣṭānām pārthivānām agnisamyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam*. Both BhV and ŚM omit *pārthivānām* and have *dravatvam adbhiḥ* for *dravatādbhiḥ*. In the case of the first difference, one could say that C and A are needlessly explicit, but it must be taken into account that in the following sūtra, which is closely parallel, all versions transmit a *taijasānām* corresponding to the *pārthivānām* here; one could argue for the priority of either reading.
2. 2.2.20 *drṣṭam adṛṣṭam*. BhV adds *ca* while ŚM does not have the sūtra.
3. 2.2.26 *tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu ca viśeṣasyobhayathādrṣṭatvāt*. BhV¹⁰⁵ and ŚM omit the *ca* (as does T).
4. 2.2.28 *acākṣuṣatvān na karma*. BhV reads *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya śabdo na karma* (2.2.24 in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, 2.2.29 in his edition of the long version), and ŚM *nāpi karmācākṣuṣatvāt*.
5. 3.1.10 *samyogi samavāyy ekārthasamavāyi kāryam kāryāntarasya kāraṇam kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtam bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasya bhūtam bhūtasya*. Aside from the question of whether or not this should be divided into a number of sūtras.¹⁰⁶

103 Cf. Candrānanda ad 8.16 *gandhajñānam ghrāṇam* (64.24), and ad 8.17 *yato rasanaṇayana-sparśanāni rasarūpasparśān abhivyañjanty ataḥ...* (65.7); Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra ad 8.2.3 glossing *gandhajñāne* with *gandhajñāpaghrāṇe*.

104 Contrary to what is reported in Thakur 1965, and in consequence also by Nozawa, the Sena Court commentary does not agree with ŚM on this, but has *yac cānyad asatas tad asat*, as subsequently edited by Thakur (326.6). The commentary clearly supports this apparently paradoxical reading; see *tasmād uktarūpād abhāvatrayād yac cā[nyā] tad* (thus Thakur; better to emend *yac cānyad*, assuming an error of *ta* for *nya*) *abhāvarūpam tad asat apyantābhāva uparthaḥ* (326.7).

105 The sūtra is not to be found in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary, but is in the long version, numbered 2.2.27 (TS 247.1).

106 This in itself can not be reckoned as a difference, as it is possible but at present impossible to prove that our hypothetical commentator also made such a division. In BhV, I follow Jambhūjaya in taking as a single sūtra, seeing no justification in the commentary for the division introduced by Thakur (probably under influence of ŚM) and followed by Nozawa.

the differences here lie in the concluding part. For *bhūtam abhūta-syābbhūtam abhūta-sya bhūtam bhūta-sya* BhV has *bhūtam abhūta-sya bhūtam bhūta-syābbhūtam bhūta-sya*; merely a different word-order. ŚM omits *kāraṇam kāraṇāntarasya* and *abhūtam bhūta-sya* (perhaps due to eyeskip), and has an anomalous masculine *bhūto* for the last *bhūtam*.

6. 4.1.4 *anīyam iti ca viśeṣapraṭiśedhabhāvaḥ*. BhV omits the sūtra, while ŚM reads *anīya iti viśeṣataḥ praṭiśedhabhāvaḥ*.
7. 4.2.1 *pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate*. BhV reads *pratyakṣāpratyakṣavṛtter apratyakṣatvād vāyuvanaspatisaṃyogavat pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate* and ŚM *pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām saṃyogasyāpratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakaṃ na vidyate*.
8. 5.1.2 *tathā musulakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca*. BhV omits, if the transmission is to be trusted here, and ŚM has *tathā hastasaṃyogāc ca musale karma*.
9. 5.2.8 *apāṃ saṃghāto vilayanaṃ ca tejasah saṃyogāt*. BhV appears not to have this sūtra; ŚM reads *tejahsaṃyogāt* for *tejasah saṃyogāt*.
10. 5.2.17 *kāyakarmaṇātmakarma vyākhyātam*. BhV reads *kāyakarmaṇātmakarmadharmayor anupapattiḥ*; ŚM omits.
11. 5.2.24 *niḥkriyāṇām samavāyah karmabhyah praṭiśiddhaḥ*. BhV reads *karmabhiḥ* for *karmabhyah* and ŚM has *niśiddhaḥ* for *praṭiśiddhaḥ*.
12. 6.1.15 *etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyah parādānaṃ vyākhyātam*. ŚM has *parasvādānaṃ* for *parādānaṃ*; the sūtra was apparently not known to BhV (cf. footnote 34 on p. 88 above).
13. 6.2.10 *ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt*. BhV omits *yamābhāvāt*. ŚM reads this as one sūtra together with the following, and has *niyamābhāvād* instead of *yamābhāvāt*.
14. 6.2.15 *trpteḥ*. BhV has *na trpteḥ* and ŚM has no equivalent.
15. 6.2.17 *icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoh pravṛttiḥ*. BhV omits the sūtra, and ŚM reads a compound *dharmādharmapravṛttiḥ* for *dharmādharmayoh pravṛttiḥ*.
16. 7.1.3 *prthivyām rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ*. BhV omits *dravyānityatvād* and reads *anityā eva* for *anityāḥ*. ŚM reads *prthivyādirūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāś ca*.
17. 7.1.7 *etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam*. BhV adds *apy* after *nityeṣv* while ŚM has *nityeṣu nityatvam* for *nityeṣv anityatvam*. The reading of A and

C is most likely to be original; ŚM may be considered to have polished away the apparent contradiction (showing a radical misunderstanding of the sūtra), while the particle in BhV has the function of drawing attention to the same paradox (and thereby safeguarding it from the same fate of 'correction').

18. 7.1.10 *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pṛthivyām pākajās ca*. Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra considers *pākajās ca* to be a separate sūtra. Both BhV and ŚM read *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ* for *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ*; the latter further has *pākajāḥ* for *pākajās ca*.
 19. 7.1.11 *apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ pākajā na vidyante*. Again BhV has *kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ* for *kāraṇaguṇapūrvāḥ*; ŚM omits the sūtra.
 20. 7.1.26 *tad anitye*. BhV reads *etad anityam* and ŚM has two sūtras, the first running *anitye 'nityam* (7.1.18) and the second *nitye nityam* (7.1.19).
 21. 7.2.10 *kāryakāraṇaikatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthakte na vidyete*. BhV reads *kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthakte na vidyete* and ŚM *kāryakāraṇayor ekatvaikapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvaikapṛthaktvam na vidyate*.
 22. 7.2.22 *śabdārthāḥ asambaddhau*. BhV and ŚM read *asambandhau* for *asambaddhau*.
 23. 7.2.33 *iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ sa samavāyah*. For *iheti* BhV and ŚM read *ihedam iti*, which, as being more explicit, is again perhaps more likely to be secondary.
 24. 7.2.34 *dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapṛtiṣedho bhāvena vyākhyātāḥ*. For *dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatva*^o BhV has *dravyaguṇakarmatva*^o and ŚM *dravyatvaguṇatva*^o.
- Sūtras in which A agrees with BhV against C and ŚM.
 1. 1.2.4 *bhāvaḥ*. C *bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva*, ŚM *bhāvo 'nūvṛtter eva hetu-
tvāt sāmānyam eva*. The A/BhV reading is certainly the most cryptic, i.e. *lectio difficilior*. ŚM goes to the other extreme, being over-explicit; almost certainly under the influence of Praśastapāda (cf. *sā* [i.e. *sattā*] *cānūvṛtter eva hetu-
tvāt sāmānyam eva* PDhS 11.13–14).
 2. 2.2.12 *ita idam iti yatas tad diśāṃ lingam*. For *diśāṃ* C has *dīśo* and ŚM *dīśyam*.
 3. 2.2.36 *saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpattiḥ*. C has *śabda-
niṣpatteḥ* for *śabdaniṣpattiḥ*; ŚM has *ca śabdāc* for *chabdāc*.

4. 5.2.12 *prthivīkarmanā tejasah karma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam*. C and ŚM read *tejahkarma* for *tejasah karma*, thus being more closely parallel to the *vāyukarma* which all versions seem to have.
5. 5.2.13 *agner ūrdhvajvalanam vāyos tīryak pavanam anumanasoś cādyam karmety adrṣṭakāritāni*. C reads *vāyoś ca* for *vāyos* and ŚM has *anūnām manasoś cādyam karmādrṣṭakāritam* for *anumanasoś cādyam karmety adrṣṭakāritāni*.
6. 5.2.19 *tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo 'prādurbhāvaś ca sa mokṣah*. C has *'prādurbhāvaḥ* for *'prādurbhāvaś ca*, and ŚM omits *sa*.
7. 6.2.8 *aśuci śucipraṭiśedhaḥ*. The manuscript has only *śucipraṭiśedhaḥ*; if I am correct in supplying only *aśuci* the text agrees with BhV alone, as C and ŚM have *aśucīti*. The omission in the manuscript is slightly more easy to explain—as a haplographical instance of eyeskip—if this is this case. The previous sūtra, defining *śuci*, lacks an *iti* in all versions, and I am inclined to think that the reading without the particle is likely to be original here too.
8. 7.2.9 *ekasyābhāvād bhāktam na vidyate*. C *ekatvasyābhāvād bhāktam na vidyate*, ŚM *ekarvābhāvād bhaktis tu vidyate*.
9. 7.2.27 *sāmayikah śabdārthapratyayaḥ*. For *śabdārthapratyayaḥ* C and ŚM have *śabdād arthapratyayaḥ*.
10. 8.1.13 *ayam eṣa tvayā bhojayainam iti buddhyapekṣam*. For *tvayā* C reads *kṛtam tvayā* and ŚM *tvayā kṛtam*.

• Sūtras in which A agrees with ŚM against C and BhV.

1. 2.1.13 *adravyatvena nityatvam uktam*. C *adravyavattvena nityatvam uktam*, BhV *adravyavattvenānityatvam uktam*.¹⁰⁷ Cf. the remarks on 1.2.9 on p. 243 above.
2. 3.2.5 *prāṇāpānanimēṣonmeṣajīvanamanogātīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnaś cātmano liṅgāni*. C differs only in having *cery ātmaliṅgāni* for *cātmano liṅgāni*, but BhV is apparently

107 Thus as printed by Thakur in his edition of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary. In his edition of the long version, the sūtra is given as *adravyavattvena nityatvam uktam*, i.e. reading as C. The commentary however seems to me to support the anomalous reading with the negative: it begins, in the long version, *adravyavattvam āśrayadravyarahitatvam adravyatvam gaganādīnām nityatvasādhakam | tac cātra nāstīti nānya nityatvam*. It may be noted, by the way, that this bit of commentary does not rule out the possibility that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra is explaining a reading *adravyatvenānityatvam uktam* instead of *adravyavattvenānityatvam uktam*.

quite different, having in place of *sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnas cātmano liṅgāni* only *parātmani*¹⁰⁸ *liṅgam*.

3. 7.1.14 *ekadravyatvāt*. C reads *ekadravyatvāt* and BhV *ekadravyatvāc ca*. Cf. the remarks on 1.2.9, p. 243 above.
4. 9.3 *asataḥ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram*. For *asataḥ* C has *asataḥ sat* and BhV *asati*. The Sena Court commentary apparently reads as do A and ŚM.

3.2.6 Evaluation

It would obviously be possible to go into much more detail in classifying and listing variants than I have done above; with four recensions to consider there are no less than 51 categories of variant possible. Such an analysis might have its uses if it were my intention to try and establish a stemma of recensions; here, however, my concern is simply to determine with some degree of exactness how A relates to the three commentary-versions. On this, the evidence presented in some detail above is sufficient to point fairly strongly to certain conclusions which can be summarized briefly.

First of all, in the light of what we have seen above, it is hardly necessary to argue further for the fact that A must be regarded as representing a recension distinct from C, BhV and ŚM. It also seems to me to be evident that A cannot have descended from any of these three, even allowing for the possibility of contamination on a fairly large scale. Note that none of the unique inclusions or readings of A betray a relationship with any of the commentaries we know.

This granted, it follows automatically. I think, that in any investigation of the philological problems of the sūtras it will be necessary to take A's testimony into consideration. Until a further representative of the A recension comes to light—the happiest chance would of course be if a manuscript containing also the hypothetical commentary were to be discovered—we are however hampered by the uncertainty attendant on the availability of but a sole source.

It also can be determined that among the versions, A is clearly closest to C. Even making allowance for a fairly large margin of error, due to the uncertainties in restoring A and the dubious text-quality of BhV, the difference between the number of A-C agreements and of A-BhV and A-ŚM agreements cannot but be regarded as significant. It is these two recensions, moreover, which have the smallest number of unique inclusions and omissions.

108 It is no doubt necessary adopt this (silent) emendation of Thakur: the manuscript has *parāmātmāni*.

On the whole, the text-quality of A seems to me to be surprisingly high. The fact that it agrees closely to C, more closely than BhV does, already suggests this, and I should say that A is definitely 'better' than both BhV (as transmitted at least) and ŚM. Above some instances were pointed out in which a unique reading in A could be older than the corresponding readings of the commentators. There are also not a few where a reading shared by A and only one of the other recensions is quite likely to be 'original.' Interpolations seem to be rare, especially by comparison with ŚM. In view of A's presumed independence, its support, especially when the three commentary-versions all differ, should be given considerable weight.

Obviously more work is necessary, but the best way forward now is probably with a detailed philological consideration of individual sūtras and groups of sūtras, attempting to reconstruct their textual history, taking into consideration all evidence, including that of secondary testimony and so on. Such investigations fall outside the scope of this work; though some remarks have been made in the previous section, these were of a scattered, unsystematical and incomplete nature—at best 'Anregungen' for the studies that remain to be done.

3.3 The Trivandrum MS

3.3.1 Description of the manuscript

The other manuscript of the VS *sūtrapāṭha* which, as I shall argue, is also a representative of an independent recension, is a palm-leaf manuscript in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum.¹ According to notes I took during a brief visit to this library in 1991, the manuscript number is 22615B, although the photocopy kindly supplied to me has the number 921B written (erroneously?) on it. It appears to be uncatalogued as yet; it is not listed in the *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. Vol. III (Ya to Sa)* (Bhaskaran 1984).

In the case of this manuscript too, a full description can not be attempted here: the remarks made are on the basis of photocopies of a portion of the manuscript. As in the case of the Ahmedabad manuscript, the text of the VS is preceded by that of the *Nyāyasūtra* without a commentary. The folios containing the VS *sūtrapāṭha* are numbered 20–34; one further leaf follows this, which is physically exactly similar to the preceding ones but is written in two hands, neither the same as that of the first 34 folios.

The leaves measure approximately 4.0×18.0 cm. There are 9 lines written one each side; the area written on measures on average about 3.0×15.0 cm. The leaves are pierced with two round holes, with a diameter of approximately 0.65 cm. The holes are symmetrically positioned, being both approximately 4.8 cm from the edge of the leaves and 1.65 cm from the top and bottom.² What is clearly unsymmetrical, however, is the amount of free space left around the two holes. The left hole is surrounded by a rectangular free area with a vertical dimension varying between approximately 1.8 and 2.2 cm and a horizontal dimension varying between approximately 2.9 and 3.5 cm. The right hole is also the centre of a free area, which is generally rectangular but sometimes roughly circular; the vertical dimension varies between approximately 1.2 and 1.5 cm and the horizontal between approximately 1.5 and 1.9 cm. The difference in height between the two free areas arises from the fact that for the left one the scribe interrupts five lines, lines 3–7,³ and for the right one only three, lines 4–6. As is customary with palm-leaf manuscripts, Northern and Southern, there are no lines defining the margin.

The manuscript is in an excellent state of preservation, and shows virtually no signs of use; thus the holes show very little wear from the string with which the

1 The first account of this manuscript was given in section III of Isaacson 1995, that report is to be regarded as superceded by the present description and edition.

2 Measuring from the closest point on the circumference.

3 Only on one of the sides available to me, f. 29r, are lines 2–7 interrupted.

manuscript is tied, and there are no marginal jottings of readers.

3.3.2 The script and the scribe

The manuscript is written in clear and neat Malayalam script. Palaeography does not allow a certain dating, but I doubt that it can have been written earlier than the nineteenth century. As punctuation, we find both dots and short *daṇḍas*; the difference between these categories is a gradual one.

The folios are numbered in the left margins of the recto sides with letter-numerals following the *nannādi* system. In colophons the scribe usually employs a sign which I take to be a stylized form of *śrī*, which has been represented as (śrī) in the diplomatic transcription.⁴

After the final colophon of the VS, there is a verse in Upendravajrā metre which appears to be scribal. Correcting the text slightly,⁵ it reads as follows.

padārthaṣaṭkapratipādanāya kaṇādamiśrai racitaṃ yathāvat |
alekhi vaiśeṣikasūtram etat trinētranāmnā dharaṇīsureṇa ||

The scribe's name thus appears to be Trinētra; exactly what is meant to be conveyed by the epithet *dharaṇīsure* I am not certain.⁶ The reference to the author of the VS as Kaṇādamiśra is consistent with the usage in the colophons of the manuscript.

If the verse was indeed written by the scribe of this manuscript, and not copied from the exemplar (a possibility which perhaps cannot be excluded), it seems that he was a man with some learning. The mistakes made in copying suggest however that the Vaiśeṣika may not have been a field with which he was particularly familiar—as would indeed probably be quite exceptional in the period in which the manuscript was copied—and give an impression of carelessness and perhaps haste, though the writing itself does not show many signs of this.

3.3.2.1 Scribal errors and corrections

Unfortunately, the number of scribal errors in this manuscript is large; markedly more so than in the Ahmedabad manuscript. A few examples of the main categories.

1. Omissions due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton or homoeoarcton). There are numerous cases of this, including some where entire sūtras can be presumed to

4 Cf. Burnell 1878, 82 and p. 44 above.

5 The diplomatic transcription may be found on p. 269 below.

6 Should one perhaps emend to *dharaṇīśvareṇa*?

have been lost, such as 1.2.16 and 1.2.17 (eyeskip caused by the recurrence of the same sūtra as 1.2.15 and 1.2.17).

2. Haplography. Rare; as in the Ahmedabad manuscript I assume that *samāvāyaḥ* at f. 31r7 is a scribal error for *sa samavāyaḥ* (7.2.33), and the eyeskip in *vidyātaś ca* for *vidyāvidyātaś ca* at f. 23v3–4 (2.2.23) may also be put in this category.
3. Dittography. Some occurrences both on word-level, e.g. *śabdāc śabdāc ca* for *chabdāc ca* at f. 24r (2.2.36), and on the level of *akṣaras*, e.g. *bhojanīyam imiti* for *bhojanīyam iti* at f. 31v7–8.
4. Metathesis. *spaśarś ca* for *sparśaś ca* at f. 22r7 (2.1.9) may be called a kind of metathesis.
5. Misreading of similar *akṣaras*. There are one or two interesting errors such as *adraṣṭakānitāni* for *adṛṣṭakāritāni* at f. 26v6. The *dra* for *ḍr* is of course a common mistake, especially in Southern manuscripts, but the confusion between *n* and *r* is one which seems to me to point to an ancestor written in some form of Devanāgarī script.⁷ There are also instances of corrected errors which confirm this; thus at f. 26v4–5 it may be significant that the scribe first wrote a *ya*, then cancelled that and continued correctly with *patanaṃ*; this suggests the possibility that the immediate ancestor of our manuscript was one in which *pa* and *ya* were difficult to tell apart, again pointing to Devanāgarī, or at least a Northern script. Similarity between *ta* and *na* in the exemplar may lie behind the *ete((ta))na* at f. 25v4 (4.1.10): another characteristic of Devanāgarī and similar Northern scripts. Note also *parimāṇarṃmāṇavyavahārakāraṇaṃ* for *parimāṇaṃ māṇavyavahārakāraṇaṃ* at f. 29v3 (7.1.17); it is plausible that one of the factors in the corruption here was that an ancestor wrote *parimāṇam māna*^o with a ligature *mm* as is quite common in Northern manuscripts. A scribe accustomed to Malayalam, in which this would always be written either with an anusvāra or with a *halanta m*, may have then assumed that the doubling was caused by a superscript *r*. The misreading of initial *a* as *sa* which may have caused the error *karmagaṇā saḡaṇāḥ* for *karmagaṇā aḡaṇāḥ* at f. 29v2 (7.1.23) is also more likely to occur in certain Northern hands than in a Southern script.

There is thus some reason to think that the exemplar from which our manuscript was copied was written in Devanāgarī. It is true that there are occasional confusions between *akṣaras* which are similar in Malayalam script, as

7 Another error which may perhaps be partly due to the same misreading is *tada sa navaḍḍhānaḥ* at f. 28r9, if the underlying reading is indeed *tathā viruddhānāḥ*; cf. footnote 55 on p. 277 below.

in *katas* for *tatas* at f. 29r3 (6.2.15), but these are less frequent and I think less significant. They may be caused by carelessness in writing rather than inaccuracy in reading.

6. Substitution of phonetically similar *akṣaras*. The confusion of *dra* and *ḍr* mentioned under the previous heading falls into this category.

There are also not a few cases where what can hardly but be a scribal omission cannot be put down to homoeoteleuton, homoeoarcton or haplography. A case in point is the omission of *āpo* in 2.1.2, at f. 22r2, or *dravyakarmasu* for *dravyaḡakarmasu* at f. 21v3 (1.2.7). In general, we may say that the scribe was more than ordinarily careless; one has the impression that his mind wandered frequently from the text he was copying.

There are a number of corrections, which seem to have been made by the scribe himself during the process of copying. Cancelled *akṣaras* are usually marked as such by a small line above them; sometimes they have been scratched out. Additions are squeezed in between the lines, usually under the *akṣara* to which they belong; there are no marginal insertions or annotations.

3.3.2.2 Ambiguities of the script

Aside from typical ambiguities of Malayalam script, notably *p/v* and *halanta m/ṃ*, it should be noted that the difference between medial *i* and *ī* is particularly slight with this scribe, and that, as mentioned above, some punctuation marks are somewhere between a dot and a short *daṇḍa*. There is a certain similarity between the signs for *halanta t* and *halanta n*; the scribe himself seems to regularly confuse them.

3.3.3 Diplomatic transcription

It should be noted that vowel signs are often (partly) on a different line (i.e. the preceding or following one) from the consonant they belong to: in the case of medial *ā* this can be clearly enough represented in the transcription (e.g. k[2]ā), but with the medial *e* for example, which is written before the consonant sign, and with complex vowel signs such as medial *o*, I have drawn attention to the fact in a footnote.

[f. 20r7] athāto dharmmaṃ [8] vyāvyaśyāmaḥ yato bhyudayaniśreyasasiddhis sa dharmmaḥ tadvacanād āmnāyapramāṇyaṃ [9] sādhanāny asya dravyaguṇa-karmmaṇi · prthivy āpas tejo vāyu+r ā+kāśaḥ kālo di[f. 20v]g ātmā mana iti nava dravyāni · rūpa(sa)(ga)ndhasparśā(nna)⁸mkhyā parimāṇāni prthaktvasaṃ[2]yogavi-bhāgau⁹ paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchātveṣaprayatnā(ntva)¹⁰ gu[3]ṇāḥ uṭkṣepaṇaṃ apakṣepaṇaṃ ākuñcanaṃ prasāraṇaṃ iti karmmaṇi · [4] sad anityaṇ dravyavaṭ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyaviśeṣavad i[5]ti dravyaguṇakarmmaṇāṃ aviśeṣaḥ | dravyāny api dravyāntaram āra[6]bhante guṇāś ca guṇāntaraṃ karmma karmmasāddhyan na vindyate | kā[7]ryāvirodhi dravyaṃ kāraṇāvirodhi ca ubha-yathā guṇaḥ kāryaviro[8]dhi karmma kriyāvaṭ guṇavaṭ¹¹ samavāyikāraṇaṃ itri¹² dravyalakṣaṇaṃ · dravyāśrayagu[9]ṇavāṭ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇaṃ anapekṣa iti guṇalakṣaṇaṃ | eka[f. 21r]vyam aguṇaṃ saṃyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṃ kāraṇaṃ iti karmma(la)¹³kṣaṇaṃ dravyaguṇaka[2]rmaṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ sāmānyam tathā guṇaḥ saṃyogavibhāganāṃ karmma · na dravyāṇ[3]āṃ vya-tire((n))+k+āt guṇavaidharmaṇāṃ na karmmaṇā dravyāṇāṃ dravyaṃ kāryaṃ [4] sāmānyam dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyā · prthaktvāsaṃyogavibh[5]āgāś cāsamavāyāt sāmānyam · kāryaṃ karmma na¹⁴ vidyate saṃ[6]yogānāṃ dravyaṃ rūpāṇāṃ rūpaṃ gurutva-prayatnasamyo[7]gānāṃ uṭkṣepaṇaṃ · saṃyogavibhā-gāḥ karmmaṇāṃ kāraṇas[8]āmānyo vyakarmmaṇāṃ karmmakāraṇaṃ uktaṃ (śrī) | iti śrīmaṭkaṇādamīśraviraci[9]te¹⁵ vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamasyāddhyāyasya prathamam āhnikam | (śrī) |

kāraṇābhāvāt [f. 21v] kāryābhāvaḥ na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ sāmānyam viśeṣa iti buddhya[2]pekṣā bhāvas sāmānyam eva dravyatvaṃ guṇatvaṃ karmma-

8 It looks as though the scribe first wrote *ya*, then, without visibly cancelling that, wrote *nna* beneath and touching it. The latter *akṣara* is presumably a mistake of *ssa*, the confusion of *na* and *sa* being frequent and easy in Malayalam script.

9 Corrected from *vibhāgo*.

10 The *akṣara* is closest to an *ntva* though it does not look quite right for that either. Certainly it does not bear a close resemblance to the required *śca*.

11 Corrected from *guṇavāt*.

12 Possibly corrected to *iti*.

13 The *akṣara* has probably been corrected from *va* to *la*.

14 Corrected from *na*.

15 The sign for medial *e* is on line 8.

tvañ ca sāmānyāni viśeṣā[3]ś ca · anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ · sad iti yato dravyakarmmasu sa [4] dravyaguṇakarmmasu rttantaram sāmānyam ekāvyatvān na dravyam [5] guṇakarmmasu cca bhāvān na karmma guṇaḥ · sāmānyaviśeṣā[6]bhāvena cca ekāvyatvena dravyatvam uktam sāmānyavi[7]śe¹⁶śābhāvena ca guṇe bhāvāt guṇatvam uktam samavāyavi[8]śe¹⁷śābhāvena ca dravyetvena prthivitvādayaḥ | sallimṅgādāviśeṣād vi[9]śeṣalimṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ (śrī) | iti śrīmatkaṇādamiśraviracite [f. 22r] vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamō ddhyāyas samāptah | (śrī) |

rūparasasparśavatī prthivī [2] rūparasasparśavatī dravyā snigdhas ca tejo rūpasparśavaṃ · vāyu sparśavāt ta [3] ākāśe na vidyante · sarppirjjatmadhūcchiṣṭānām agnisamyogā[4]d dravyatāt̥bhis sāmānyam trapusīsaloharajatasuva[5]mṇānān taijasānām agnisamyogād dravyatāt̥bhi[6]s sāmānyam viśānī kakutmāt̥ prāntebāladhis sāsānādi[7]mān iti (g)o¹⁸tve (dṛ)ṣṭam liṃgam · spaśars ca · na ca draṣṭānām sparśa i[8]ty adṛṣṭalimṅgo vāyuh (·) adravatvā dravyam kriyāvatvāt guṇavatvāc | adravya[9]tve nityatvam uktam · vāyor vāyusamūhanan nānatve liṃgam · vāyur iti sanni[f. 22v]karṣe pratyakśābhāvād dṛṣṭam liṃgan na vidyate · sāmānyatodṛṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ ta[2]smād āgamikaṃ samjñākarmma tv asya viśiṣṭānām liṃgam | pratyakśāpūrvakatā samjñā[3]ākarmmaṇaḥ niṣkramaṇaṃ praveśanam ity ākāśasya (ni)+li+mgaṃ · tad alimṅga[4]m e¹⁹katvāt karmmaṇaḥ kāraṇāntarāsak(!)ptivaidhammyāc ca [5] samyogābhāvād abhāva ka(ṇṇa)ṇaḥ kāraṇaguṇapūrva[6]kaḥ kāryaguṇo dṛṣṭaḥ kāryāntaraprādu(r)bhāvāc ca · śabda spa[7]rśavatām guṇaḥ²⁰ paratra samavā[8]yāt pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ guṇas sa liṃgam ākāśasya dra[9]vyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte tatvaṃ bhāvena · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣika[f. 23r]sūtre dvitīyasyāddhyāyasya prathama(ṃ)m āhnikam · (śrī) ·

puṣpavastrayos sannikarṣe ga[2](r)āndhāntarapradubhāvo vastre · gandhābhāvalimṅgam · etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā [3] vyavasthitā prthivyām gandhaḥ apsu śītātā tejasy uṣṇatā aparasmi[4]t̥ param aparaṃ yugapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣipram iti kālaliṃg[5]āni dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte · tatvaṃ bhāve[6]na kāryaviśeṣe²¹ṇa nānātvaṃ aparasmiṃ paraṃ yu[7]gapad ayugapac ciraṃ kṣepam ity nityeṣv abhāvād ((e))anityeṣu ca bh[8]āvāt kālākhyā · ita idam iti yatas tad diśo liṃgam dravyatvanityatve vāyunā [9] vyākhyāte · tatvaṃ bhāvena · kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvaṃ a(ti)+di+tyasamprayogāt [f. 23v] bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācīm tathā dakṣiṇā pratīcy udīcī ca · etena digantarāṇi [2] vyākhyātāni

16 The sign for medial *e* is on line 6.

17 The sign for medial *e* is on line 7.

18 Possibly corrected from *ho*.

19 The *prṣṭhamātra* medial *e* is on line 3.

20 After this a space large enough to have accommodated up to 13 *akṣaras* is left open, no doubt because there is a clearly visible flaw in the palm-leaf.

21 After this *akṣara* a small gap has been left open because of another flaw in the palm-leaf.

· sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca [3] saṃśayaḥ
 drṣṭam adṛṣṭan drṣṭaṇ ca drṣṭavaṭ yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭa(ṣc)²²ād vidyā[4]-
 taś ca saṃśayaḥ śrotagrahaṇo yo rtthas sa śabdāś tasmīn [5] dravya—m—
 guṇaḥ kammeti²³ saṃśayaḥ tulyajātīyeṣv arth[6]āntareṣu vicitraśeṣasyobha-
 yathadrṣṭatvād ataddravyatvā[7]n na dravyam acakṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya
 guṇasya sato pasarggaḥ karmma[8]bhis sādhyam sato liṅgābhāvāt nityavai-
 dhamyāt kāryatvāc ca śabdavya[9](n)kābhāvāt kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt
 doṣāt saṃyogavibh[f. 24r]āgāc śabdāc śabdāc ca śabdanīṣpatteḥ liṅgāc cānityaḥ
 ((dva))dvayoḥ pravṛtyo²⁴r a[2]bhāvāt saṃkhyābhāvāc ca prathamaśabdāt saṃ-
 pratipattibhāvāc ca sandigdadhā santi [3] bahutve saṃkhyābhāvas sāmānyataḥ
 prathamaśabdāś saṃpratipatti[4]bhāvaṇ ca · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyo
 ddhyāyaḥ · [5] (śrī) ·

prasiddhā indriyārtthāḥ indriyārtthaprasiddhir indriyārtthe[6]bhyo²⁵ ntartthāntara-
 tve hetuḥ so napadeśaḥ kāraṇā[7]jñānāt kāryajñānāt · ajñānāc ca · anya eva hetur ity
 a[8]napadeśa arthhāntarasyaṇapadeśaḥ saṃyogasamavāyy ekārtthasamavāyy a[9]-
 virodhi ca kāryam kāryāntarasya kāraṇam kāraṇāntarasya virodhy a[f. 24v]bhū-
 tam bhūtasya bhūtam abhūtasyābhūtam abhūtasya prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvādapa-
 deśasya [2] apraṇī tasmāt gaur iti ca taṭ karmmendriyamanorthasannikarṣān niṣpa-
 dyate [3] tad anyat pravṛttinivṛtti pratyagātmadṛṣṭe paratra liṅgam · (śrī) · i[4]ti vai-
 šeṣikasūtre tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam · (śrī) ·

kā[5]mendriyārtthasannikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca [6] manaso liṅgam ·
 dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyā[7]te prayatnāyugapadyāt jñānāyugapadyāc
 caikam prā²⁶ṇā[8]pānanimeṣonmeṣajīvanamatīndriyāntaravikārās sukhaduḥkhe-
 cchādve²⁷[9]ṣaprayatnāś cety ātma liṅgāni · dravyanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte
 deva[f. 25r]datta iti sannikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvā drṣṭam liṅgam na vidyate sā-
 mānyato²⁸[2]draṣṭatvāś cāviśeṣaḥ tasmād āgamikam · aham iti śabdavyatirekān
 nāg[3]āmikam · yadi ca drṣṭapratyakṣo han devadatto yajñadatta iti de²⁹[4]vadatto
 gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīty upacārāc śārī[5]rāpratyakṣaḥ · na tu sandigdhas
 tūpacārāḥ aham iti pratyagā[6]tmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthhāntarapratyakṣa ·

22 The scribe seems to have written a ṣ with a c below it and touching it. Perhaps the ṣ was meant to be cancelled.

23 After this a space large enough for up to 4 akṣaras was left open, because of another flaw in the palm-leaf.

24 Probably corrected from *trvā* by the cancellation of the first *t* and the addition of the *pr* in *prathamātra* curve to change *ā* to *o*.

25 The *pr* in *prathamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 5.

26 Corrected from *pra* by the addition of the sign for medial *ā* beneath and to the right of the *ā* curve.

27 The scribe started to write something else, probably *ve*, and then corrected to *dve*.

28 The stroke of the medial *o* after the consonant sign is on line 2.

29 The medial *e* is on line 3.

na tu śa[7]rīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrāyo jñānaviśeṣaḥ sukha[8]duḥkhañjāna-
niṣpatyaviśeṣād aikātmyaṃ · nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ ś[9]āstrasāmārthyāc ca ·
(śrī) · iti vaiśeṣiśūtre tṛtīyo ddhyāyas samāptaḥ · (śrī) |

[f. 25v] yad akāraṇavat ta(n) ni³⁰tyaṃ tasya kāryaṃ liṅgaṃ kāraṇābhāvād dhi
kāryābhāvaḥ [2] nityaṃ iti ca viśeṣata³¹ḥ pratiśedhābhāvaḥ avidyā ca · ma-
haty anekadravyatv[3]āt paramānvān anupalabdhiḥ · anekadravyeṇa samavāyād
rū[4]paviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ ete((ta))na rasagandhaspa[5]śe³²ṣu jñānaṃ
vyā³³khyātam · tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ saṃkhy[6]āparimāṇāni pr((ru))thaktva-
saṃyogavibhāgau para[7]tvāparatvaikatve ca rūpadravyasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāni [8]
arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt etena guṇatve bhāve³⁴ ca sarvendriyajñānaṃ [9] vyā³⁵khyā-
taṃ · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣiśūtre caturthasyāddhyāsyā((?))³⁶dyam āhnikam | (śrī) |

[f. 26r] pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakan na vidya-
[2]te³⁷ guṇāntaraprādubhbhāvāc ca tryātmakam api na · manaātmasaṃyogas tv avi-
prati[3]śindho mithaḥ pañcānām anekadeśapūrvakatvād dharmmaviśe[4]ṣāt samā-
khyābhāvāt santy ayonijāni vedaliṅga[5]āc ca | (śrī) | iti vaiśeṣiśūtre caturthā-
ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |

[6] ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karmma tathā musalaka[7]rmmā hastasaṃ-
yogāc ca · abhighātaje musalakarmmaṇi vyatirekā[8]d akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ ·
tathākṣasaṃyogo hastakarmmaṇi musalābhigh[9]ātāt tu musalasaṃyogān dhaste
karmma kathātmakarmma hastasaṃyogāc ca · saṃ[f. 26v]yogabhāve na gurutvāt
patanaṃ nodanaviśeṣabhāvān norddhvan na [2] tiryag gamanaṃ prayatnaviśeṣān
nodanaviśeṣa³⁸ḥ nodanaviśeṣād uda[3]śanaviśeṣaḥ hastakarmmaṇā dārukarmma
vyākhyātaṃ tathā dagddha[4]sya visphoṭanaṃ prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya
(ya) [5] patanaṃ tṛṇakarmma vāyusaṃyogāt maṇigamaṇaṃ sūcya[6]bhisa-
marppaṇam ity adraṣṭakānitāni iṣāv ayaṃgaṃ saṃ[7]yogaviśeṣaḥ karmmānyatve
hetuḥ nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ [8] karmmakāritvāc ca saṃskārād uttaran tatho-
ttaram uttān ca saṃskārābhā[9]ve³⁹ gurutvāt patanaṃ | (śrī) | iti vaiśeṣiśūtre
pañcamasyādyam āhnikam [f. 27r] | (śrī) |
nodanābhighātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca prthivyāṃ kaṃ tad viśeṣa[2]ñādrṣṭakāritam

30 The *akṣara* has perhaps been corrected from *ni* to *nni*.

31 The *akṣara* has probably been corrected from *da*.

32 The sign for medial *e* is on line 4.

33 The sign for medial *ā* has been added beneath and to the right of the *akṣara*.

34 The consonant sign has probably been corrected, but I am not sure from what.

35 The sign for medial *ā* has been added below and to the right of the consonant sign.

36 The cancelled *akṣara* probably a ligature.

37 The sign for medial *e* is on line 1.

38 The sign for medial *ā* has been added beneath and to the right of the consonant sign.

39 The sign for medial *e* is on line 8.

apām saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam · dravyatvāt [3] syandanam · nādyā vā-
yusaṃyogād āherāharanam · nodanā[4]pīdanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca vṛkṣābhi-
sappanam i[5]ty adṛṣṭakāritam apām saṃghāto vilayanañ ca te[6]jasaṃyogāt
tatra yasphūrjathul(1)ṅgam | vaidikaś ca | [7] apām saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca
stanayittah prthivīkarmmaṇā [8] tejahkarmmaṇā vāyukarmma ca vyākhyātam
agner ūrddhvajvalanam vāyo[9]s tiryak panam aṇumanasoś cādyam karmmety
adṛṣṭakāritāni hastakarmmaṇā [f. 27v] <(ya)> manasaḥ karmma vyākhyātam ātme-
ndriyārthasannikaṣāt sukhaduḥkhe | tadā[2]<?>raṃbha ātmaso manasi śarīrasya
sukhaduḥkhābhāvāt saṃyoga k[3]āyakarmmaṇātmakarmma vyākhyātam apa-
sappanam aśitapītasam[4]yo⁴⁰gāḥ kāyāntara<(na)>saṃyogāś cety adṛṣṭakāri[5]tāni
· tadabhāve saṃyogabhāvo prādurbhāvaś ca [6] mo⁴¹kṣaḥ dravyaguṇakarmma-
niṣpattivaidhammyāt bhāvas tamaḥ | [7] tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca · dirkkālāv
ākāśaś ca [8] kriyāvaḥbhyo vaidhammyān niṣkriyāni · etena karmmaṇi guṇāś ca
vyākhyā[9]tāḥ niṣkriyānām samavāyah karmmaṇy apratiśiddhaḥ | kāraṇatvāt⁴²
samavāyi[f. 28r]no guṇāḥ guṇair dḍig vyākhyātā kāraṇena kālah (śrī) iti vaiśeṣi-
[2]kasūtre pañcamo ddhyāyah | (śrī) |

buddhipūrvavākyakṛtir vede na cāsmāt bu[3]ddhibhyo liṅgam ṛ(kṣa)ṣeḥ tathā brā-
hmaṇe saṃjñākarmma siddhi[4]l(1)ṅgam buddhipūrvō dadāti mahīne cāpravṛtīḥ
ta[5]thā pratigrahaḥ tayos tu kramo yathā itaretarām[6]gabhūtānām (·) ātmaguṇesv
ātmāntaraguṇānām akāra[7]ṇatvāt <?>⁴³ amṛṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato bhyu-
dada[8]yas tad amṛṣṭabhojane na vidyate | viśiṣṭe pravṛtīḥ same hīne cāpravṛ[9]tīḥ
etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadharmmikebhyas tada<(śa)nuvidhānāñ ca tyāgaḥ · [f. 28v]
sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ · (śrī) | iti vai[2]śeṣikasūtre
ṣaṣṭhasyāddhyāsyādyam āhnikam | (śrī) |

daśānān drṣṭaprayoja[3]nānām adṛṣṭābhāve prayogo bhyudayāya · abhiṣecano-
[4]pavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthayajña<?>[5]dānaprokṣaṇadina-
kṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭ[6]āya · cāturaśramyam upadhā ca · bhāvadoṣa
upadh[7]ā | adoṣo nupadhā iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśam prokṣi[8]tāñ ca śuci aśu-
cīti śucipratīṣedhaḥ arthhānāñ ca ayatasya śuci[9]bhojanābhyudayo na vidyate ·
yamābhāvād vidyate cānarthhātara[f. 29r]tvād yamasya na vyāsaṃgabhojanavad
abhisandhiśuddhyabhāvāt icchādveṣa[2]pūrvikā dharmmādharmmayoḥ pravṛtīḥ
katas saṃyogo vibhā<(ga)>[3]gañ ca karmmasu mokṣo vyākhyātah · (śrī) iti
vaiśeṣikasū[4]tre⁴⁴ ṣaṣṭho ddhyāyah | (śrī) |

40 The *prṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 3.

41 The *prṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 5.

42 The sign for medial *ā* and the *l* may both have been cancelled, though the 'cancellation marks' could also be small flaws in the palm-leaf.

43 The cancelled character may be the beginning of initial *a*.

44 The sign for medial *e* is on line 3.

uktā guṇāḥ guṇalakṣaṇī coktaṃ [5] i{ta}dam evaṃguṇam iti coktaṃ pṛthavyām rūparasagandha[6]sparśadravyānityatvād anityāḥ agnisamyogac ca guṇā[7]nta-raprādurbhāvāt etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktaṃ · a{((spa))}[8]psu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyanityatvāt anityeṣv anityā dravyā[9]nityatvāt kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyā{h}+m+ pākajās ca apsu tejasi [f. 29v] vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pākā{((jñā))}+jā+ na vidyate agūṇavato dravya[2]sya guṇāntarārambhāt karmmaguṇā agūṇāḥ etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ sva[3]bhāvavirodhāt parimāṇarmmāṇavyavahā-rakāraṇam a[4]ṇo⁴⁵ mmahāntas ca (·) upalabdhyanupalabdhi nitye vyākhyā[5]te · kāraṇamahatvāt bahutvāt kāraṇamahatv[6]āt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat · tadvi-parītam aṇu a[7]ṇu mahad iti tasmin viśeṣābhāvāc ca ekakālātā dṛṣṭi[8]āntāc ca · aṇutvamahatvayor aṇutvamahatvābhāvāḥ karmmaguṇair vyākhyātāḥ · [9] aṇutva-mahatvābhyām karmmaguṇāt saguṇāḥ etena dīrghatvahrāsavate vy[30r]ākhyāte · karmabhiḥ karm māṇi guṇe gguṇaiḥ tad anityeṣv anityan nityam parima[2]ṇḍa-lam avidyā vidyāliṅgam vibhāvān mahān ākāśaḥ · tathā cātmā · tadabhāvā[3]d aṇu manaḥ guṇair dḍik vyākhyātā · kāraṇena kālaḥ · (śrī) | iti [4] vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamasyāddhyāsyādyam āhni[5]kaṃ · (śrī) ·

rūparasagandhasparśavyatire{ka}kāḍ arthānta[6]ram ekatvam tathā pṛthaktva⁴⁶m | tayo nnityānitya[7]tve⁴⁷ tejaso rūpasparśābhyām vyākhyāte | karmabhiḥ karm māṇi | [8] guṇe gguṇāḥ samkhyatvāt karm māṇam sarvaikatvan na vidy-ate kāryakāraṇa[9]yor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete · etad ani[f. 30v]tyayo vyākhyātām | anyatarakarm mājā ubhayasamyogajāḥ karm mājās ca samyo[2]gaḥ etena vibhāgo vyākhyātāḥ | samyogavibhāgayos samyogavi[3]bhāvo ṇutvamahatvābhyām vyākhyātāḥ karmabhiḥ karm māṇi | gu[4]ṇai⁴⁸gguṇāḥ yutasiddhyābhāvāt kāryakāraṇayos sam[5]yogavibhāgā na vidyante · guṇatvāt guṇe ca [6] bhāsyate · ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvād atī[7]tānāgata-pratyayābhāvāt prasamgāt asti {t}nāstīti pra[8]yogāt śabdārthav asaṃbandhau samyogino daṇḍāt samavāyi[9]no viśāṇāc cādṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ ana-vamiṣṭagrahaṇāc ca [f. 31r] tathāpratyayābhāvāḥ saṃbandhasaṃbandhād iti cet sandehaḥ akrts(n)ak[2]āritvāt sāmāyikāś śabdād arthapratyayaḥ ekadikkālābhyām sannikṛṣṭavi[3]prakṛṣṭābhyām param apadam kāraṇaparativāt kāraṇāpara[4]tvāc ca parativāparatve parativāparatvayoḥ pa[5]rativāparativābhāvo ṇutvamahatvābhyām vyākhyā[6]taḥ · karmabhiḥ karm māṇi · guṇai gguṇāḥ · iheti yataḥ [7] kāryakāra-ṇayos samavāyaḥ dravyatvaguṇatvakarmmatvapratī[8]śedho bhāvena vyākhyātāḥ | tatvam bhāvena · (śrī) · iti vaiśeṣikasūtre [9] saptamo ddhyāyaḥ · (śrī) |

45 The *prṣṭhamātra* stroke of the medial *o* is on line 3.

46 Corrected from *tva* by squeezing a *k* in.

47 The sign for medial *e* is on line 6.

48 The sign for medial *ai* is on line 3.

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātaṃ · mana ātmā ca jñānani[f. 31v]rddai⁴⁹so jñānaniṣpattir
uktā | guṇakarmmasv asannikṛṣṭeṣu jñānaniṣpatte dra[2]vyam kāraṇam kāraṇākā-
raṇaṃ ca sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu (dha) sāmānyaviśeṣā[3]bhāvāt ta-ta eva jñānaṃ samānya-
viśeṣāpekṣan dravyagu[4]ṇakarmmasu dravye dravyaguṇāpekṣam guṇakarmmasu
guṇa[5]karmābhāvāt guṇakarmāpekṣan na vidyate · samavāyi[6]śvāityā śvāi-
tyabuddhe śvete buddhis te kārya[7]kāraṇabhūte dravyeṣv anitaviśeṣāt ayam eṣa
tvayā bho⁵⁰[8]janīyam imiti buddhyapekṣa dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adṛṣṭeṣv abhāvād artha
iti dravya[9]guṇakarmmasu dravyeṣu pañcātmakam pratyuktam bhūyastvāc ca
pṛthivī gandhajñā[f. 32r]ne tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśa-
viśeṣāt | (śrī) | [2] iti vaiśeṣikasūtre aṣṭamo ddhyāyah | (śrī) |

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvāt a[3]saṭ · sad asatas saṭ kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād
arthāntaram sac ca [4] sad yac cānyaṭ satas tad asaṭ asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvā[5] |
smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca · etenāghaṭo gau[6]r adharmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ
abhūtan nāṭa ity anarthāntaram nā[7]sti ghaṭo neha iti sato ghaṭasya nehasamyo-
gapratīṣe[8]dhaḥ nāsty anyas candramā iti sāmānyāc candramasi pratīṣedhaḥ sad
asarvaidharmmyāt k[9]ārye sadasattā na(ṃ)++ ātmany ātmamanasos samyoga-
viśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam · [f. 32v] tathā dravyāntareṣu · ātmendriyamanorthisanni-
karṣāc ca tatśamavāyāt [2] karmmaguṇeṣu ātmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu · asyedam
kāryam kāraṇam sam[3]bandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti laiṃgikam ete[4]na
śābdam vyākhyātaṃ hetur upadeśa liṃgan nimittam [5] pramāṇam ity anarthā-
ntaram asyedam iti buddhyapekṣa[6]tvāt ātmamanasos samyogaviśeṣāt skār[7]āc
ca smṛtiḥ tathā svapnāntikan dharmmyāś (c)a · indriyā[8]doṣā[8] | samskārāc
cāmithyā tad aduṣṭam jñānam aduṣṭam etat siddhadarśana[9]n ca dharmmebhyah
(śrī) | iti vaiśeṣikasūtre navamo ddhyāyah | (śrī) |

ātmasa[f. 33r]mavāyas sukhaduḥkhaḥ pañcabho rthāntaratve hetuḥ tadātrayi-
bhyas ca guṇe[2]bhyah iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇaviśeṣāvirodhāc ca mithas sukhaduḥkhaḥ or
arthāntarabh[3]āvaḥ saṃśayanirṇayāntābhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ tayo[4]r
nniṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṃgikābhyām vyākhyātā bhūtam iti pratyā[5]kṣam vyā-
khyātam | bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare draṣṭatvāt tathā [6] bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo
nirapekṣebhyas ca | abhūd ity a[7]bhūtatvāt sati ca kāryāsamavāyāt ekārthasa-
mavāyīṣu kā[8]raṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa ity ekasmit śiraḥ prṣṭam pāṇir iti
tadvi[9]śeṣebhyah kāraṇam iti dravye kāryasamavāyāt samyogād vā kāraṇasama-
[f. 33v]vāyāt karma tathā rūpe kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca | kāraṇasamavāy[2]āt
samyoge kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca | samyuktasamavāyād agne [3] vai⁵¹śeṣi-
kam laiṃgike pramāṇam vyākhyātam dṛṣṭānān dṛ[4]ṣṭaprayojanān dṛṣṭābhāve
prayogo bhyudayāya | [5] tadvavacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam | (śrī) iti śrīmatkāṇā-

49 The first stroke of the sign for medial *ai* is on f. 31r9.

50 The stroke of the medial *o* after the consonant sign is on line 8.

51 The first stroke of the sign for medial *ai* is on line 2.

dami[6]śraviracitavaiśeṣikasūtre da(śa)śamo(d(dh)ya)ddhyāyaḥ | (śrī) |
 [7] vaiśeṣikasūtram samāptam | (śrī) | padārthaṣaṭkapatipādanā[8]ya kaṇādamiśrai
 racitam yathāvaḥ alekhi vaiśeṣikasūtram eta kṛitri[9]netranāmnā dharaṇīsureṇa |
 (śrī) | śubham astu | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) | (śrī) |

3.3.4 Reconstruction of the *sūtrapāṭha*

Reading through the diplomatic transcription given immediately above, it will have become clear that the text of this manuscript is plagued by scribal errors to such an extent that reconstruction of the hyparchetype is far more uncertain a business than it was with the Ahmedabad manuscript. Omissions, which can usually be put down to eyeskip, are quite frequent, as the number of words and even entire sūtras placed in square brackets below indicates. I have found it particularly difficult to decide to what extent sūtras omitted can be safely supposed to have been present in the hyparchetype. In general, if a sūtra is testified to unanimously by all other versions and if there is further a plausible mechanical cause for its omission, I have supplied it—though if there is more than one reading known elsewhere it is a further difficulty to decide what form it is most likely to have taken in T.

- athāto dharmam vyākhyāsyāmaḥ || 1.1.1 ||
 yato 'bhyudayaniḥśreyasasiddhiḥ sa dharmah || 1.1.2 ||
 tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 1.1.3 ||
 sādhanāny asya dravyaguṇakarmāṇi || 1.1.4 ||
 pṛthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaḥ kālo dig ātmā mana iti nava dravyāṇi ||
 1.1.5 ||
 rūparasagandhasparśāḥ samkhyā parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṁ samyogavibhāgau
 paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnās ca
 guṇāḥ || 1.1.6 ||
 utkṣepaṇam apakṣepaṇam ākuñcanaṁ prasāraṇam iti karmāṇi || 1.1.7 ||
 sad anityaṁ dravyavat kāryaṁ kāraṇaṁ sāmānyaviśeṣavad iti dravya-
 guṇakarmaṇām aviśeṣaḥ || 1.1.8 ||
 dravyāṇy api dravyāntaram ārabhante || 1.1.9 ||
 guṇās ca guṇāntaram || 1.1.10 ||
 karma karmasādhyam na vidyate || 1.1.11 ||
 kāryāvirodhi dravyaṁ kāraṇāvirodhi ca || 1.1.12 ||
 ubhayathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.13 ||
 kāryāvirodhi karma || 1.1.14 ||
 kriyāvad guṇavat samavāyikāraṇam iti dravyalakṣaṇam || 1.1.15 ||
 dravyāśrayy aguṇavān samyogavibhāgeṣv akāraṇam anapekṣa iti
 guṇalakṣaṇam || 1.1.16 ||
 ekadravyam aguṇaṁ samyogavibhāgeṣv anapekṣaṁ kāraṇam iti
 karmalakṣaṇam || 1.1.17 ||
 dravyaguṇakarmaṇām dravyaṁ kāraṇaṁ sāmānyam || 1.1.18 ||
 tathā guṇaḥ || 1.1.19 ||
 samyogavibhāgānām karma || 1.1.20 ||
 na dravyāṇām vyatirekāt || 1.1.21 ||

guṇavaidharmyān na karmaṇām || 1.1.22 ||
 dravyāṇām dravyam kāryam sāmānyam || 1.1.23 ||
 dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pṛthaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca ||
 1.1.24 ||
 asamavāyāt sāmānyam kāryam karma na vidyate || 1.1.25 ||
 saṃyogānām dravyam || 1.1.26 ||
 rūpānām rūpam || 1.1.27 ||
 gurutvaprayatnasamāyogānām utkṣepaṇam || 1.1.28 ||
 saṃyogavibhāgāḥ karmaṇām || 1.1.29 ||
 kāraṇasāmānye dravyakarmaṇām karmākāraṇam uktam || 1.1.30 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamasyādhyāyasya prathamam āhnikam ||

kāraṇābhāvāt kāryābhāvaḥ || 1.2.1 ||
 na tu kāryābhāvāt kāraṇābhāvaḥ || 1.2.2 ||
 sāmānyam viśeṣa iti buddhyapekṣam || 1.2.3 ||
 bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva || 1.2.4 ||
 dravyatvam guṇatvam karmatvam ca sāmānyāni viśeṣāś ca || 1.2.5 ||
 anyatrāntyebhyo viśeṣebhyaḥ || 1.2.6 ||
 sad iti yato dravya[guṇa]karmasu sā [sattā] || 1.2.7 ||
 dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaram sāmānyam || 1.2.8 ||
 ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 1.2.9 ||
 guṇakarmasu ca bhāvān na karma [na] guṇaḥ || 1.2.10 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.11 ||
 ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam || 1.2.12 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.13 ||
 guṇe bhāvād guṇatvam uktam || 1.2.14 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca || 1.2.15 ||
 [karmaṇi bhāvāt karmatvam uktam] || 1.2.16 ||
 [sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvena ca] || 1.2.17 ||
 dravyatvena pṛthivītvādayaḥ || 1.2.18 ||
 sallīṅgaviśeṣād viśeṣalīṅgābhāvāc caiko bhāvaḥ || 1.2.19 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre prathamō 'dhyāyaḥ samāptah ||

rūparasasparśavatī pṛthivī || 2.1.1 ||
 rūparasasparśavatya [āpo] dravāḥ snigdhas ca || 2.1.2 ||
 tejo rūpasparśavat || 2.1.3 ||
 vāyuḥ sparśavān || 2.1.4 ||
 ta ākāśe na vidyante || 2.1.5 ||
 sarpirjatmadhūcchiṣṭānām agnisamāyogād dravatādbhiḥ sāmānyam ||
 2.1.6 ||

trapuṣīsaloharajatasuvarṇānām taijasānām agniśaṃyogād dra-
vatādbhiḥ sāmānyam || 2.1.7 ||

viṣāṇī kakudmān prāntevāladhiḥ sāsānādimān iti gotve dr̥ṣṭam liṅgam
2.1.8 ||

sparsāś ca || 2.1.9 ||

na ca dr̥ṣṭānām sparśa ity adṛṣṭaliṅgo vāyuh || 2.1.10 ||

adravyatvād dravyam || 2.1.11 ||

kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ca || 2.1.12 ||

adravyatvena nityatvam uktam || 2.1.13 ||

vāyor vāyusammūrccanam nānātve liṅgam || 2.1.14 ||

vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dr̥ṣṭam liṅgam na vidyate
2.1.15 ||

sāmānyatodr̥ṣṭāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 2.1.16 ||

tasmād āgamikam || 2.1.17 ||

saṃjñākarma tv asmadviśiṣṭānām liṅgam || 2.1.18 ||

pratyakṣāpūrvakatvāt saṃjñākarmaṇaḥ || 2.1.19 ||

niṣkramaṇam praveśanam ity ākāśasya liṅgam || 2.1.20 ||

tad aliṅgam ekadravyatvāt karmaṇaḥ || 2.1.21 ||

kāraṇāntarānukūptivaidharmyāc ca || 2.1.22 ||

saṃyogābhāvād abhāvaḥ karmaṇaḥ || 2.1.23 ||

kāraṇaguṇapūrvakaḥ kāryaguṇo dr̥ṣṭaḥ || 2.1.24 ||

kāryāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca śabdaḥ sparśavatām aguṇaḥ || 2.1.25 ||

paratra samavāyāt pratyakṣatvāc ca nātmaguṇo na manoguṇaḥ
2.1.26 ||

guṇaḥ saṃli liṅgam ākāśasya || 2.1.27 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.1.28 ||

tattvam bhāvena || 2.1.29 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyasyādhyāyasya prathamam āhnikam⁵²

puṣpavastrayoḥ saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre gandhā-
bhāvaliṅgam || 2.2.1 ||

etenāpsūṣṇatā vyākhyātā || 2.2.2 ||

vyavasthitaḥ pṛthivyām gandhaḥ || 2.2.3 ||

apsu śītātā || 2.2.4 ||

tejasy uṣṇatā || 2.2.5 ||

aparasmīn param yugapad ayugapad ciraṃ kṣipram iti kālaliṅgāni⁵²

2.2.6 ||

52 The partial repetition of this sūtra in the manuscript, a few lines later, I regard as an inadvertent scribal error.

- dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.7 ||
 tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.8 ||
 kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.9 ||
 nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt || 2.2.10 ||
 [kāraṇe] kālākhyā || 2.2.11 ||
 ita idam iti yatas tad diśo liṅgam || 2.2.12 ||
 dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 2.2.13 ||
 tattvaṃ bhāvena || 2.2.14 ||
 kāryaviśeṣeṇa nānātvam || 2.2.15 ||
 ādityasamprayogād [bhūtapūrvād] bhaviṣyato bhūtāc ca prācī ||
 2.2.16 ||
 tathā dakṣiṇā pratīcy udīcī ca || 2.2.17 ||
 etena digantarāṇi vyākhyātāni || 2.2.18 ||
 sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśa-
 yaḥ || 2.2.19 ||
 dṛṣṭam adṛṣṭam || 2.2.20 ||
 dṛṣṭam ca dṛṣṭavat || 2.2.21 ||
 yathādṛṣṭam ayathā[dṛṣṭam ubhayathā]dṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.22 ||
 [vidyā]vidyātaś ca saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.23 ||
 śrotragrahaṇo yo 'rthaḥ sa śabdaḥ || 2.2.24 ||
 tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ || 2.2.25 ||
 tulyajātīyeṣv arthāntarabhūteṣu viśeṣasyubhayathādṛṣṭatvāt || 2.2.26 ||
 ekadravyatvān na dravyam || 2.2.27 ||
 acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya || 2.2.28 ||
 guṇasya sato 'pavargaḥ karmabhiḥ sādharmyam || 2.2.29 ||
 sato liṅgābhāvāt || 2.2.30 ||
 nityavaidharmyāt || 2.2.31 ||
 kāryatvāc ca || 2.2.32 ||
 śabdavyaṅjakābhāvāt || 2.2.33 ||
 kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt || 2.2.34 ||
 doṣāt || 2.2.35 ||
 saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdaniṣpatteḥ || 2.2.36 ||
 liṅgāc cānityaḥ || 2.2.37 ||
 dvayoḥ pravṛttyor abhāvāt || 2.2.38 ||
 saṃkhyābhāvāc ca || 2.2.39 ||
 prathamāśabdāt || 2.2.40 ||
 sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.41 ||
 saṃdigdhāḥ sati bahutve || 2.2.42 ||
 saṃkhyābhāvāḥ sāmānyataḥ || 2.2.43 ||
 prathamāśabdaḥ || 2.2.44 ||

sampratipattibhāvāc ca || 2.2.45 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre dvitīyo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

prasiddhā indriyārthāḥ || 3.1.1 ||

indriyārthaprasiddhir indriyārthebhyo 'rthāntaratve hetuḥ || 3.1.2 ||

so 'napadeśaḥ || 3.1.3 ||

kāraṇājñānāt || 3.1.4 ||

kāryājñānāt || 3.1.5 ||

ajñānāc ca || 3.1.6 ||

anya eva hetur ity anapadeśaḥ || 3.1.7 ||

[arthāntaram hy] arthāntarasyanapadeśaḥ || 3.1.8 ||

saṃyogi samavāyī ekārthasamavāyī virodhi ca kāryaṃ kāryāntarasya
kāraṇaṃ kāraṇāntarasya virodhy abhūtaṃ bhūtasya bhūtaṃ abhū-
tasyābhūtaṃ abhūtasya [bhūtaṃ bhūtasya] || 3.1.9 ||

prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād apadeśasya || 3.1.10 ||

[viśāṇī tasmād aśvo] viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti ca || 3.1.11 ||

ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣād [yan] niṣpadyate tad anyat || 3.1.12 ||

pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra līṅgam || 3.1.13 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre tṛtīyasyādyam āhnikam ||

ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣe jñānasyābhāvo bhāvaś ca manaso līṅgam
3.2.1 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.2 ||

prayatnāyugapadyāj jñānāyugapadyāc caikam || 3.2.3 ||

prāṇāpānanimēṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukha-
duḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmalīṅgāni || 3.2.4 ||

dravyatvanityatve vāyunā vyākhyāte || 3.2.5 ||

devadatta iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād dṛṣṭaṃ līṅgaṃ na vidyate
3.2.6 ||

sāmānyatodṛṣṭatvāc cāviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.7 ||

tasmād āgamikam || 3.2.8 ||

aham iti śabdavyatirekān nāgamikam || 3.2.9 ||

yadi ca dṛṣṭapratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto yajñadatta iti || 3.2.10 ||

devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatiṭy upacārāc charāpratyakṣaḥ
3.2.11 ||

saṃdigdhas tūpacāraḥ || 3.2.12 ||

aham iti pratyagātmani bhāvāt paratrābhāvād arthāntarapratyakṣaḥ
3.2.13 ||

na tu śārīraviśeṣād yajñadattaviṣṇumitrayor jñānaviśeṣaḥ || 3.2.14 ||

sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpattyaviśeṣād aikātmīyam || 3.2.15 ||

nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ || 3.2.16 ||

śāstrasāmarthyāc ca || 3.2.17 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre tṛtīyo 'dhyāyaḥ samāptaḥ ||

yad akāraṇavat tan nityam || 4.1.1 ||

tasya kāryaṃ liṅgam || 4.1.2 ||

kāraṇābhāvād dhi kāryābhāvaḥ || 4.1.3 ||

nityam iti ca viśeṣataḥ pratiśedhābhāvaḥ || 4.1.4 ||

avidyā ca || 4.1.5 ||

mahaty anekadravyatvād [rūpāc copalabdhiḥ] || 4.1.6 ||

[adravyatvāt] paramāṇāv anupalabdhiḥ || 4.1.7 ||

[rūpasamskārābhāvād vāyāv anupalabdhiḥ] || 4.1.8 ||

anekadravyeṇa samavāyād rūpaviśeṣāc ca rūpopalabdhiḥ || 4.1.9 ||

etena rasagandhasparśeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.10 ||

tadabhāvād avyabhicāraḥ || 4.1.11 ||

saṃkhyāḥ parimāṇāni pṛthaktvaṃ saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve

[karma] ca rūpidravayasamavāyāc cākṣuṣāni || 4.1.12 ||

arūpiṣv acākṣuṣatvāt || 4.1.13 ||

etena guṇatve bhāve ca sarvendriyajñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 4.1.14 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre caturthasyādhyāyasyādyam āhnikam ||

pratyakṣāpratyakṣāṇām apratyakṣatvāt saṃyogasya pañcātmakam na
vidyate || 4.2.1 ||

guṇāntarāprādurbhāvāc ca tryātmakam api na || 4.2.2 ||

manaātmasaṃyogas tv avipratiśiddho mithaḥ pañcānām || 4.2.3 ||

anekadeśapūrvakatvāt || 4.2.4 ||

dharmaviśeṣāt || 4.2.5 ||

samākhyābhāvāt || 4.2.6 ||

[saṃjñādimattvāt] || 4.2.7 ||

santy ayonijāni || 4.2.8 ||

vedalingāc ca || 4.2.9 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre caturthādhyāyaḥ ||

ātmasaṃyogaprayatnābhyāṃ haste karma || 5.1.1 ||

tathā musalakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.2 ||

abhighātaje musalakarmaṇi vyatirekāc akāraṇaṃ hastasaṃyogaḥ ||

5.1.3 ||

tathātmasaṃyogo hastakarmani || 5.1.4 ||

musulābhighātāt tu musulasaṃyogād dhaste karma || 5.1.5 ||

tathātmakarma hastasaṃyogāc ca || 5.1.6 ||

saṃyogābhāve na gurutvāt patanam⁵³ || 5.1.7 ||
 nodanaviśeṣābhāvān nordhvaṃ na tiryag gamanam || 5.1.8 ||
 prayatnaviśeṣān nodanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.9 ||
 nodanaviśeṣād udasanaviśeṣaḥ || 5.1.10 ||
 hastakarmanā dāra-karma vyākhyātam || 5.1.11 ||
 tathā dagdhasya visphoṭanam || 5.1.12 ||
 prayatnābhāve gurutvāt suptasya patanam || 5.1.13 ||
 tṛṇakarma vāyusaṃyogāt || 5.1.14 ||
 maṇigamanam sūcyabhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.1.15 ||
 iṣāv ayugapat saṃyogaviśeṣāḥ karmānyatve hetuḥ || 5.1.16 ||
 nodanād ādyam iṣoḥ karma karmakāritāc ca saṃskārād uttaram tatho-
 ttaram uttaram ca || 5.1.17 ||
 saṃskārābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.1.18 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre pañcamasy[ādhyaṃsya]ādyam āhnikam ||

nodanābhīghātāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca pṛthivyām karma || 5.2.1 ||
 tad viśeṣeṇādṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.2 ||
 apām saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam || 5.2.3 ||
 dravatvāt syandanam || 5.2.4 ||
 nādyā vāyusaṃyogād āhārārohaṇam || 5.2.5 ||
 nodanāt pīdanāt saṃyuktasaṃyogāc ca || 5.2.6 ||
 vṛkṣābhisarpaṇam ity adṛṣṭakāritam || 5.2.7 ||
 apām saṃghāto vilayanam ca tejaḥsaṃyogāt || 5.2.8 ||
 tatṛvasphūrjathur liṅgam || 5.2.9 ||
 vaidikam ca || 5.2.10 ||
 apām saṃyogād vibhāgāc ca stanayitnuḥ || 5.2.11 ||
 pṛthivīkarmanā tejaḥkarma vāyukarma ca vyākhyātam || 5.2.12 ||
 agner ūrdhvajvalanam vāyos tiryakpavanam aṇumanasoś cādyam
 karmety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.13 ||
 hastakarmanā manasaḥ karma vyākhyātam || 5.2.14 ||
 ātmendriyārthasaṃnikarṣāt sukhaduḥkhe || 5.2.15 ||
 tadanārambha ātmasthe manasi śarīrasya sukhaduḥkhābhāvāt saṃ-
 yogah || 5.2.16 ||
 kāyakarmanātmakarma vyākhyātam || 5.2.17 ||
 apasarpaṇam [upasarpaṇam] aśītapītasamṃyogāḥ kāryāntarasamṃyogāś
 cety adṛṣṭakāritāni || 5.2.18 ||
 tadabhāve saṃyogābhāvo prādurbhāvaś ca mokṣaḥ || 5.2.19 ||
 dravyaguṇakarmaniṣpattivaidharmyād abhāvas tamah || 5.2.20 ||

53 Very uncertain: cf. p. 294 below.

tejaso dravyāntareṇāvaraṇāc ca || 5.2.21 ||
 dikkālāv ākāśaś ca kriyāvadbhyo vaidharmyān niṣkriyāṇi || 5.2.22 ||
 etena karmāṇi guṇāś ca vyākhyātāḥ || 5.2.23 ||
 niṣkriyāṇaṃ samavāyaḥ karmaṇy apratiṣiddhaḥ || 5.2.24 ||
 kāraṇatvāt samavāyino guṇāḥ || 5.2.25 ||
 guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 5.2.26 ||
 kāraṇena kālāḥ || 5.2.27 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre pañcamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||
 buddhipūrvā vākyakṛtir vede || 6.1.1 ||
 na cāsmadbuddhibhyo liṅgam ṛṣeḥ || 6.1.2 ||
 tathā brāhmaṇe saṃjñākarmasiddhir liṅgam || 6.1.3 ||
 buddhipūrvō dadātiḥ⁵⁴ || 6.1.4 ||
 tathā pratigrahaḥ || 6.1.5 ||
 tayos tu kramo yathānitaretarāṅgabhūtānām || 6.1.6 ||
 ātmaḥ guṇeṣv ātmāntaraguṇānām akāraṇatvāt || 6.1.7 ||
 aduṣṭabhojanāt samabhivyāhārato 'bhyudayaḥ || 6.1.8 ||
 tad duṣṭabhojane na vidyate || 6.1.9 ||
 viśiṣṭe pravṛttiḥ || 6.1.10 ||
 same hīne cāpravṛttiḥ || 6.1.11 ||
 etena hīnasamaviśiṣṭadhārmikebhyah [parasvādānaṃ vyākhyātam] ||
 6.1.12 ||
 tathā viruddhānām⁵⁵ ca tyāgaḥ || 6.1.13 ||
 sama ātmatyāgaḥ paratyāgo vā || 6.1.14 ||
 viśiṣṭa ātmatyāgaḥ || 6.1.15 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre ṣaṣṭhasyādhyāyasyādyam āhnikam ||
 dṛṣṭānām dṛṣṭaprayojanānām adṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayaḥ ||
 6.2.1 ||
 abhiṣecanopavāsabrahmacaryagurukulavāsavānaprasthyayañjādāna-
 prokṣaṇadinnakṣatramantrakālaniyamāś cādṛṣṭāya || 6.2.2 ||
 cāturāśramyam || 6.2.3 ||
 upadhā ca || 6.2.4 ||
 bhāvadoṣa upadhā || 6.2.5 ||

54 The *mahīne cāpravṛttiḥ* found after this sūtra in the manuscript is apparently a result of a strange eyeskip forward, to 6.1.11, though there is no apparent cause for such an error.

55 Assuming that these words, attested by all other versions, underlie the transmitted *tadanu-vidhānāḥ*; metathesis of *viru* to *ruvi* and misreading of *ru* as *nu* may be one of the steps of corruption involved. If so, the *r/n* confusion suggests an ancestor written in Devanāgarī (cf. p. 260 above).

adoṣo 'nupadhā || 6.2.6 ||
 iṣṭarūparasagandhasparśaṃ prokṣitam [abhyukṣitam] ca śuci || 6.2.7 ||
 aśucīti śucipraṭiṣedhaḥ || 6.2.8 ||
 arthāntaraṃ ca || 6.2.9 ||
 ayatasya śucibhojanād abhyudayo na vidyate yamābhāvāt || 6.2.10 ||
 vidyate cānarthāntaratvād yamasya || 6.2.11 ||
 na vyāsaṅgo bhojanavat || 6.2.12 ||
 abhisam̐dhisuddhyabhāvāt || 6.2.13 ||
 icchādveṣapūrvikā dharmādharmayoḥ pravṛttiḥ || 6.2.14 ||
 tataḥ saṃyogo vibhāgaś ca || 6.2.15 ||
 karmasu mokṣo vyākhyātāḥ || 6.2.16 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre ṣaṣṭho 'dhyāyaḥ ||

uktā guṇāḥ || 7.1.1 ||
 guṇalakṣaṇaṃ cōktam || 7.1.2 ||
 idam evaṃguṇam [idam evaṃguṇam] iti cōktam || 7.1.3 ||
 pṛthivyāṃ rūparasagandhasparśā dravyānityatvād anityāḥ || 7.1.4 ||
 agnisam̐yogāc ca || 7.1.5 ||
 guṇāntaraprādurbhāvāt || 7.1.6 ||
 etena nityeṣv anityatvam uktam || 7.1.7 ||
 apsu tejasi vāyau ca nityā dravyan̐ityatvāt || 7.1.8 ||
 anityeṣv anityā dravyān̐ityatvāt || 7.1.9 ||
 kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pṛthivyāṃ pākajās ca || 7.1.10 ||
 apsu tejasi vāyau ca kāraṇaguṇapūrvakāḥ pākajā na vidyante || 7.1.11 ||
 aguṇavato dravyasya guṇāntarārambhāt karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.12 ||
 etena pākajā vyākhyātāḥ || 7.1.13 ||
 svabhāvavirodhāt || 7.1.14 ||
 parimāṇaṃ mānavyavahārakāraṇam || 7.1.15 ||
 aṇor mahataś copalabdhyanupalabdhī nitye vyākhyāte || 7.1.16 ||
 kāraṇabahutvāt kāraṇamahattvāt pracayaviśeṣāc ca mahat || 7.1.17 ||
 tadviparītam aṇu || 7.1.18 ||
 aṇu mahad iti tasmin [viśeṣabhāvād] viśeṣābhāvāc ca || 7.1.19 ||
 ekakālatvāt || 7.1.20 ||
 dṛṣṭāntāc ca || 7.1.21 ||
 aṇutvamahattvayor aṇutvamahattvābhāvāḥ karmaguṇair vyākhyātāḥ
 7.1.22 ||
 aṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ || 7.1.23 ||
 etena dīrghatvahr̥asvatve vyākhyāte || 7.1.24 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.1.25 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.1.26 ||

tad anityeṣv anityam || 7.1.27 ||
 nityaṃ parimaṇḍalam || 7.1.28 ||
 avidyā vidyāliṅgam || 7.1.29 ||
 vibhavān mahān ākāśaḥ || 7.1.30 ||
 tathā cātmā || 7.1.31 ||
 tadabhāvād aṇu manah || 7.1.32 ||
 guṇair dig vyākhyātā || 7.1.33 ||
 kāraṇena kālāḥ || 7.1.34 ||

iti vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamasyādhyāsyādyam āhnikam ||

rūparasagandhasparśavyatirekāḍ arthāntaram ekatvam || 7.2.1 ||
 tathā prthaktvam || 7.2.2 ||
 tayor nityānityatve tejaso rūpasparśābhyāṃ vyākhyāte || 7.2.3 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.4 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.5 ||
 niḥsaṃkhyatvād [guṇa]karmaṇāṃ sarvaikatvaṃ na vidyate || 7.2.6 ||
 kāryakāraṇayor ekatvapṛthaktvābhāvād ekatvapṛthaktve na vidyete ||
 7.2.7 ||

etad anityayor vyākhyātam || 7.2.8 ||
 anyatarakarmaja ubhayakarmajaḥ saṃyogajaś ca saṃyogaḥ || 7.2.9 ||
 etena vibhāgo vyākhyātāḥ || 7.2.10 ||
 saṃyogavibhāgayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ
 vyākhyātāḥ || 7.2.11 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.12 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.13 ||
 yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgā na vidyante ||
 7.2.14 ||

guṇatvāt || 7.2.15 ||
 guṇe ca bhāṣyate || 7.2.16 ||
 ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvāt || 7.2.17 ||
 atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāt || 7.2.18 ||
 prasaṅgāt || 7.2.19 ||
 asti nāstīti prayogāt || 7.2.20 ||
 śabdārthāv asambandhau || 7.2.21 ||
 saṃyogino daṇḍāt samavāyino viśāṇāc ca || 7.2.22 ||
 adṛṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ || 7.2.23 ||
 anavamṛṣṭagrahaṇāc ca || 7.2.24 ||
 tathāpratyayābhāvāḥ || 7.2.25 ||
 sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṃdehaḥ || 7.2.26 ||
 akṛtsnakāritvāt || 7.2.27 ||

sāmayikaḥ śabdād arthapratyayaḥ || 7.2.28 ||
 ekadikkālābhyāṃ saṃnikṛṣṭaviprakṛṣṭābhyāṃ param aparam
 7.2.29 ||
 kāraṇaparativāt kāraṇāparativāc ca parativāparatve || 7.2.30 ||
 parativāparativayoḥ parativāparativābhāvo 'ṇutvamahattvābhyāṃ vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.31 ||
 karmabhiḥ karmāṇi || 7.2.32 ||
 guṇair guṇāḥ || 7.2.33 ||
 iheti yataḥ kāryakāraṇayoḥ [sa] samavāyaḥ || 7.2.34 ||
 dravyatvaguṇatvakarmatvapratishedho bhāvena vyākhyātaḥ || 7.2.35 ||
 tattvaṃ bhāvena || 7.2.36 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre saptamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

dravyeṣu jñānaṃ vyākhyātam || 8.1 ||
 mana ātmā ca || 8.2 ||
 jñānanirdeśe jñānaniṣpattir uktā || 8.3 ||
 guṇakarmasv asaṃnikṛṣṭeṣu jñānaniṣpatter dravyaṃ kāraṇaṃ kāraṇa-
 kāraṇaṃ ca || 8.4. ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣeṣu sāmānyaviśeṣābhāvāt tata eva jñānaṃ || 8.5 ||
 sāmānyaviśeṣapekṣaṃ dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.6 ||
 dravye dravyaguṇa[karmā]pekṣam || 8.7 ||
 guṇakarmasu guṇakarmābhāvād guṇakarmāpekṣaṃ na vidyate || 8.8 ||
 samavāyīśvaityāc chvaityabuddheḥ śvete buddhis te kāryakāraṇabhū-
 te || 8.9 ||
 dravyeṣv anitaraviśeṣāt || 8.10 ||
 ayam eṣa tvayā bhojanīyam iti buddhyapekṣam || 8.11 ||
 dṛṣṭeṣu bhāvād adrṣṭeṣv abhāvāt || 8.12 ||
 artha iti dravyaguṇakarmasu || 8.13 ||
 dravyeṣu pañcātmakaṃ pratyuktam || 8.14 ||
 bhūyastvād [gandhavattvāc] ca pṛthivī gandhajñāne || 8.15 ||
 tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt || 8.16 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre 'ṣṭamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād asat || 9.1 ||
 sad [asat] || 9.2 ||
 asataḥ sat kriyāguṇavyapadeśābhāvād arthāntaram || 9.3 ||
 sac cāsat || 9.4 ||
 yac cānyat satas tad asat || 9.5 ||
 asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvāt smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca || 9.6 ||
 etenāghaṭo 'gaur adharmaś ca vyākhyātaḥ || 9.7 ||

abhūtaṃ nātīta ity anarthāntaram || 9.8 ||
 nāsti ghaṭo geḥa iti sati ghaṭasya geḥasamyogapratīṣedhaḥ || 9.9 ||
 nāsty anyas candraṃ ity sāmānyāc candramasi pratīṣedhaḥ || 9.10 ||
 sadasator vaidharṃyāt kārye sadasattā na || 9.11 ||
 ātmany ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣād ātmapratyakṣam || 9.12 ||
 tathā dravyāntareṣu || 9.13 ||
 ātmendriyamanorthasaṃnikarṣāc ca || 9.14 ||
 tatsamavāyāt karmaguṇeṣu || 9.15 ||
 ātmasamavāyād ātmaguṇeṣu || 9.16 ||
 asyedaṃ kāryaṃ kāraṇaṃ sambandhy ekārthasamavāyi virodhi ceti
 laṅgikam || 9.17 ||
 etena śābdaṃ vyākhyātaṃ || 9.18 ||
 hetur apadeśo līgaṃ nimittaṃ pramāṇam ity anarthāntaram || 9.19 ||
 asyedaṃ ity buddhyapekṣatvāt || 9.20 ||
 ātmamanasoḥ saṃyogaviśeṣāt saṃskārāc ca smṛtiḥ || 9.21 ||
 tathā [svapnaḥ] || 9.22 ||
 svapnāntikam || 9.23 ||
 dharmāc ca || 9.24 ||
 indriyadoṣāt saṃskārāc cāvidyā || 9.25 ||
 tad duṣṭaṃ jñānam || 9.26 ||
 aduṣṭaṃ etat || 9.27 ||
 siddhadarśanaṃ ca dharmebhyaḥ || 9.28 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre navamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||

ātmasamavāyaḥ sukhaduḥkhaḥ pañcabhyo 'rthāntaratve hetus
 tadāśrayibhyaś ca guṇebhyaḥ || 10.1 ||
 iṣṭāniṣṭakāraṇaviśeṣād virodhāc ca mithaḥ sukhaduḥkhaḥ arthāntara-
 bhāvaḥ || 10.2 ||
 saṃśayanirṇayāntarābhāvaś ca jñānāntaratve hetuḥ || 10.3 ||
 tayoḥ niṣpattiḥ pratyakṣalaiṃgikābhyāṃ vyākhyātā || 10.4 ||
 bhūtaṃ ity pratyakṣaṃ vyākhyātaṃ || 10.5 ||
 bhaviṣyatīti kāryāntare dṛṣṭatvāt || 10.6 ||
 tathā bhavatīti sāpekṣebhyo nirapekṣebhyaś ca || 10.7 ||
 abhūd ity abhūtāt || 10.8 ||
 sati ca kāryāsamavāyāt || 10.9 ||
 ekārthasamavāyiṣu kāraṇāntareṣu darśanād ekadeśa ity ekasmin ||
 10.10 ||
 śiraḥ pṛṣṭham pāṇir ity tadviśeṣebhyaḥ || 10.11 ||
 kāraṇam ity dravye kāryasamavāyāt || 10.12 ||
 saṃyogād vā || 10.13 ||

kāraṇasamavāyāt karma || 10.14 ||
 tathā rūpe kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.15 ||
 kāraṇasamavāyāt saṃyoge || 10.16 ||
 kāraṇākāraṇasamavāyāc ca || 10.17 ||
 saṃyuktasamavāyād agner vaiśeṣikam || 10.18 ||
 laiṅgike pramāṇaṃ vyākhyātam || 10.19 ||
 dṛṣṭānāṃ dṛṣṭaprayojanānāṃ dṛṣṭābhāve prayogo 'bhyudayāya
 10.20 ||
 tadvacanād āmnāyaprāmāṇyam || 10.21 ||
 iti vaiśeṣikasūtre daśamo 'dhyāyaḥ ||
 vaiśeṣikasūtraṃ samāptam ||

3.3.5 Analysis of variants

Contrary to what might, justly enough, be expected, I do not intend here to apply in all respects the same procedure followed with regard to the Ahmedabad manuscript in section 3.2.5 above; in particular variants on the level of readings of a sūtra will be treated much more selectively. I feel that the reconstruction is doubtful at too many places for it to be helpful to collect all instances of patterns of agreements. Before looking at T's readings, however, it may briefly be pointed out that exactly the same considerations which led me to the conclusion that the Ahmedabad manuscript's immediate ancestor also contained the *sūtrapāṭha* with no commentary (cf. p. 230 above) hold good here. Thus here too, although punctuation usually marks the end of a sūtra there are some places where it must clearly be wrong,⁵⁶ and here too we find some omissions which must be caused by eyeskip between words in different sūtras.⁵⁷

Now let us look at the sūtras which are omitted or included in T alone (alone being defined here with respect to the three commentary texts).

- Sūtras found in T alone.

1. 1.1.4 *sādhānāny asya dravyaguṇakarmāṇi*. This sūtra apparently serves to some extent a similar purpose as ŚM's 1.1.4 (on which see p. 234 above); its inclusion may have been (partly) motivated by the desire to express more clearly and explicitly how the actual contents of the VS are relevant to the *dharma* of 1.1.1, which is declared in 1.1.2 to have as its ultimate aim both worldly and supreme good. The fact that only the first three categories are mentioned makes a more archaic impression, however, than ŚM's 1.1.4. In this case it is worth noticing the resemblance with the words with which Candrānanda introduces 1.1.4 (≈ T 1.1.5): *uktaṃ dharmasvarūpaṃ tallakṣaṇaṃ ca | sādhanāny asyedānīm dravyaguṇakarmāṇi vakṣyāmaḥ* (2.11). This is certainly striking, but it would be over hasty to conclude that it must point to a relationship; there is nothing particularly specific in the words found in common and even without knowing Candrānanda's commentary it is not unlikely that another Vaiśeṣika author felt something along these lines to be required here. What is more, Praśastapāda also has a sentence which, though less immediately striking in its similarity, could have been the source both of Candrānanda's remark and this sūtra.

56 E.g. *vastre · gandhābhāvaliṅgaṃ* at f. 23r2 (2.2.1).

57 A particularly clear case which allows for no other explanation is *mahatṛy anekadravyatvāt paramānvāy anupalabdhiḥ* for *mahatṛy anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ* (4.1.6) *adravyatvāt paramānvāy anupalabdhiḥ* (4.1.7) at f. 25v2–3.

In the section on *dharma* in the PDhS we read *tasya tu sādhanāni śrutismṛtivyihitāni varṇāśramiṇāṃ sāmānyaviśeṣabhāvenāvasthitāni dravyaguṇakarmāṇi* (272.11–13); note that none of Praśastapāda's commentators see a reference to a sūtra in this.

2. 1.1.18 *dravyatvena pṛthivītvādayaḥ*. There is nothing in any of the commentaries to have suggested this, but it is a not unnatural extension of the discussion of universals in the preceding sūtras (1.2.3–17). No doubt one is meant to supply either *uktāḥ* (as in 1.2.12, 1.2.14 and 1.2.16) or *vyākhyātāḥ*.
3. 6.2.12 *na vyāsaṃgo bhojanavat*. This sūtra resembles nothing in any other recension. Unfortunately, it is not clear to me what exactly it means, though it clearly forms a part of the discussion of the means to *dharma*. Note first of all that the manuscript in fact has *vyāsaṃgaḥ* rather than *vyāsaṃgo*, but I find this uninterpretable.⁵⁸ The previous three sūtras deal in particular with the question of *yama*, 'self-restraint,' and whether this is a necessary requirement for *abhyudaya*, without which *śucibhojana* does not have the desired effect. In 6.2.11 (≈ C 6.2.10) *vidyate cānarthāntaraivād yamasya*, Candrānanda, who has the same reading, interprets *anarthāntaraivād yamasya* as meaning 'because *yama* is not distinct from effort (*prayama*).'⁵⁹ which is not very convincing, in view of the fact that none of the preceding sūtras refers directly to *prayama*. Śaṃkara Miśra, who seems to read as a single sūtra together with the preceding one, has a different interpretation of the same words, understanding them as meaning 'because *yama* is different from eating.'⁶⁰ Now the *bhojanavat* in the present sūtra suggests that *anarthāntaraivād* in 6.2.11 is to be understood with respect to *bhojana*. Still I am not sure what exactly the intended sense is; one possibility would be 'there is no strong attachment [to *yama*] just as [there is none to the] eating [of pure things which leads to *abhyudaya*].'⁶¹ Much depends on whether the exegetical tradition reflected by T agreed with Candrānanda in understanding 6.2.10 (≈ C 6.2.9) as a *pūrvapakṣa* answered by 6.2.11 (≈ C 6.2.10), or whether it is to represent the *siddhānta*, as seems to be the case in Bhaṭṭa

58 For a different possible emendation see the discussion of 6.2.13 on p. 285 below.

59 *na prayatnavyatirekīyamaḥ, prayatnābhāve sarvasyāḥ kriyāyā abhāvād vidyate śucim bhōjam upayujjānasya prayatnaḥ* is Candrānanda's commentary on the sūtra (49.21–22).

60 The relevant part of Śaṃkara Miśra's commentary runs *bhojanād arthāntaram yata yamaḥ* (274.8).

61 In itself, the wording also allows a translation such as 'there is no strong attachment [to *yama*] as [there is to] eating.'

Vādīndra's interpretation, though that commentator appears not to have *yamābhāvāt* in 6.2.10 and omits 6.2.11 altogether.

For another possible reading and interpretation see the following discussion of 6.2.13.

4. 6.2.13 *abhisam̐dhiśuddhyabhāvāt*. This doubtless still belongs to the same discussion as 6.2.12, and is therefore surrounded by much of the same uncertainty. In itself, the sense is plain; one may translate 'because of the absence of purity of intention,' but what ellipsis is to be supplied depends on how the line of argument in the entire group of sūtras is understood.

One possibility which should be mentioned is that this in fact should be taken as a single sūtra together with the previous one, and that it forms an instance of a sūtra with the syntactical construction *na* plus argument expressed by a word in the ablative (cf. p. 246 and footnote 89 above). In that case, however, the emendation *vyāsam̐go bhojanavat* may be wrong;⁶² one does not expect a nominative.⁶³ Another, also fairly minor, emendation might be to read *na, vyāsaktabhojanavad abhisam̐dhiśuddhyabhāvāt*, which could mean 'No [there is no exaltation through eating pure food for one who is not self-restrained, as is wrongly maintained by an opponent in 6.2.11 objecting to the *siddhānta* position expressed in 6.2.10], because [such a person] has no purity of intention, just as [in the case of] the eating of someone who has strong attachments.'⁶⁴ Here the same observation can be made as in footnote 62 (with regard to a somewhat different interpretation); one would be happier if 6.2.11 read *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya* as is found in A alone.

Finally, I am conscious that there are still other possible interpretations (and emendations) possible for these two sūtras; *vyāsam̐ga* could for in-

62 It might also be right: one could perhaps interpret *na, vyāsam̐go bhojanavad abhisam̐dhiśuddhyabhāvāt* as 'No [there is no exaltation through eating pure food for one who is not self-restrained, as is wrongly maintained by an opponent in 6.2.11 objecting to the *siddhānta* position expressed in 6.2.10], [for] there is strong attachment [when one is not self-restrained?], because there is no purity of intention as [there must be?] in the case of eating pure food.' This reading of the passage would work much better though, or so it seems to me, if 6.2.11 read *vidyate cārthāntaratvād yamasya* (where one could then take *arthāntara* in the technical sense of 'irrelevant') as is A's reading.

63 The nominative is most natural if *na vyāsam̐go* is taken together as a syntactical unit, as in the interpretations considered in the discussion of 6.2.12 above. Cf. however also the previous footnote.

64 Yet another alternative would be to render *vyāsaktabhojanavat* 'just as [in the case of] the eating of something to which one is strongly attached.'

stance have been intended in a sense different from that assumed above. I shall not attempt anything like a complete inventory of possibilities, preferring to leave the matter for the present; it is to be hoped that some parallel material may be found which might allow the argument to be reconstructed with more certainty.

5. 7.1.14 *svabhāvavirodhāt*. This sūtra follows the section on *pākaja* qualities, and seems to replace the sūtra *ekadravyatvāt* (thus A and ŚM; cf. p. 256 above) found in one form or another at the same place in the other versions of the *sūtrapāṭha*. The commentators Candrānanda and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra both understand the sūtra in their text as referring to a *virodha*—the colour of the pot (and its atoms) before and after the process of firing is different, and from the (apparent) contradiction of these different colours inhering in the same substance (the atoms according to Candrānanda, the atoms and the pot in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's *piṭharapākavāda*) one is led to conclude that the colour (and so on) of earth substances, even the eternal atoms, can be destroyed and produced by conjunction with fire. T's sūtra expresses this a little more clearly perhaps, and it should also be noted that the word *svabhāva* is not found elsewhere in the sūtras.
6. 7.1.15 *parimāṇam mānavyavahārakāraṇam*. This is identical with the opening sentence of the section on size in the PDhS (130.20), and has probably been borrowed from that source, or incorporated from a commentary which quoted it. There is no indication that any of the commentators on the PDhS took the sentence as a quotation.
7. 7.2.18 *atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāt*. This is apparently meant as an additional argument to prove that there is no direct connection between a word and its object. It might be easier to interpret if we 'corrected' the text to *atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāt*; word and object are not directly connected because sometimes the object which we cognize through a word is one which lies only in the past or the future. I am wary of this correction, however. Another possibility would be to take it as a *prasaṅga* argument; because there could be no cognition of a past or future object from words if such cognitions must always be based on a real connection between word and object. If this latter interpretation is correct, it raises the question whether this sūtra and the next actually should be read as one,⁶⁵ perhaps correcting to *atītānāgatapratyayābhāvāpra-*

65 The use of a *halanta* form of *t* at the end of this sūtra suggests that the scribe at least thought it a distinct sūtra, but one need not place too much weight on this.

saṅgāt. Either way, I do not find this argument in the VS commentators or the PDhS.

8. 7.2.19 *prasaṅgāt*. This could belong with 7.2.18, as suggested above, but it might also be intended to provide yet another argument. In the latter case, it is unfortunate that the sūtra does not make clear what *prasaṅga* is involved. Note that the word does not occur elsewhere in the VS, though it is of common occurrence in the *Nyāyasūtra*.
 9. 7.2.24 *anavamṛṣṭagrahaṇāc ca*. This seems the most economical correction of the manuscript's *anavamiṣṭagrahaṇāc ca*, though I am not sure exactly how to take *anavamṛṣṭa*. A more or less literal translation could be something like 'And because [one also] grasps something that has not been touched/considered,' but as with 6.2.12–13 it is difficult to be certain how this is supposed to fit in the line of argument. Again there is no resemblance to anything in any other recension. The ablative could be taken as giving a second argument for the thesis put forward at the end of the previous sūtra (*ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*, which I assume should be understood more or less as Candrānanda, who reads the same, does), but it would also be not impossible to construe the ablative with the *arthapratyayābhāvaḥ* of the following sūtra. In the latter case it could of course be taken together with that as a single sūtra. No other occurrences of *ava√mṛś* are to be found in the VS, nor for that matter in the *Nyāyasūtra*.
 10. 7.2.27 *akṛtsnakāritvāt*. Presumably this sūtra should be taken as an explicative addition, perhaps from a commentary. It would be possible to read it with either the preceding sūtra, *sambaddhasambandhād iti cet saṁdehaḥ*, or with the following one, *sāmayikaḥ śabdād arthapratyayaḥ*. In the latter case, which seems to me more likely, it is also possible that it is not intended as a separate sūtra.⁶⁶ A possible interpretation would be 'Because [a word] does not perform [its task of conveying a particular sense] for all [people, since some who have not learned the relevant linguistic convention will not have cognition of the object,]⁶⁷ [the cognition of an object from a word is based on convention].'
- Sūtras omitted in T alone. This is a rather dubious category; I have already supplied several sūtras in the reconstruction which are not in the manuscript

66 In opting to take it as a separate sūtra I allowed myself to be influenced by the fact that the final *t* is written with the *halanta* form rather than forming a ligature with the initial *sā* of 7.2.27.

67 Or 'Because [a word] does not perform [its task of conveying a particular sense] fully (i.e. for all people).' The sense is virtually the same.

(cf. p. 270 above) but it is possible that some of those were already lacking in the hyparchetype, while conversely it cannot be excluded that the ones mentioned below did belong to it.

1. C 6.1.10–11 ≈ BhV 6.1.10 ≈ ŚM 6.1.7–8. Possibly lost through eyeskip, as 6.1.9 (6.1.6 in ŚM) ends with the same word, *vidyate*, as the second of these sūtras. But this second one appears to lack a counterpart in BhV,⁶⁸ and on the chance that this is indeed so and that therefore it is not unanimously transmitted, I have chosen not to supply the two sūtras in T.

To sum up this part of our analysis: T has far more unique inclusions than A did, and these inclusions are interesting and significant, much more so than the omissions of which one cannot rule out that they are accidents of (post-hyparchetype) transmission. Looking at these elsewhere unattested sūtras, there are I think none for which a convincing case could be made that they are 'original,' i.e. of an antiquity equal to that of the main body of the VS. This does not however mean that they are not worth attention; they shed a dim but valuable light on hitherto unknown aspects of the exegesis of the sūtras and the development of the school. Their distribution is interesting, with six out of ten sūtras occurring in the seventh *adhyāya* and four of these in the course of the exposition of a single topic, the relation of word and object. Though there is one case (1.1.4; cf. p. 283) where a relationship might be suspected with Candrānanda's commentary,⁶⁹ the others show that there must be other influences at work. The only case where we may feel relatively certain about the origin of a sūtra is 7.1.15, which I think must derive directly or indirectly from the PDhS (cf. p. 286 above); there is a possibility that the same applies to 1.1.4 (cf. p. 284 above).

As for the unique inclusions and omissions of the other four recensions, listed on pp. 232–240 above, it may be noted that none of the inclusions are shared by T; there are however four omissions that are.⁷⁰

68 Cf. footnote 32 on p. 87 above.

69 For other evidence suggesting a relation not merely with C but with Candrānanda's commentary, see the remarks apropos of T's 2.1.27 on p. 291 below.

70 Two other cases which should be noted: T 4.1.8 is in fact omitted in the manuscript, though I have supplied it, assuming yet another loss due to eyeskip (homoeoteleuton). This is one of the unique omissions of A listed above (p. 237; cf. also p. 241). Nothing can be concluded from this, the possibility of homoeoteleuton as a cause of the omission in either or both of the manuscripts cannot be ruled out. T 4.2.10 *vedalingāc ca* omits what in C is the first half of the same sūtra, namely the words *santy ayonijāḥ*; in ŚM this is a separate sūtra (4.2.10). BhV omits altogether (i.e. does not have *vedalingāc ca* either); cf. p. 237 above.

1. BhV's omission of C 3.2.17 \approx ŚM 3.2.21 \approx A 3.2.18. There is no apparent cause of omission for purely mechanical reasons.
2. C's omission of BhV 4.2.5 *tac ca śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijaṃ ayonijaṃ ca* \approx ŚM 4.2.5 *tatra śarīraṃ dvividhaṃ yonijaṃ ayonijaṃ ca* \approx A 4.2.4 *tad ayonijaṃ* (see p. 247 above). This looks a potentially significant case. There is no apparent reason for the sūtra to be omitted as a simply mechanical variation, and the content of the sūtra seems also a little suspicious. No two of the sources which do have it reads exactly the same, and BhV and ŚM seem somewhat suspiciously close to a sentence in Praśastapāda's PDhS section on earth, running *śarīraṃ* (several manuscripts and editions read *tatra śarīraṃ*) *dvividhaṃ, yonijaṃ ayonijaṃ ca*. Its inclusion adds nothing of substance; it only serves to render the structure of the *āhnika* a little clearer, coming as it does between the sūtras which apply to ordinary bodies made of earth and the sūtras aimed at establishing that there are also bodies which are *ayonija*. Remember also that a few sūtras earlier, at the start of this section on bodies, ŚM (alone) had another sūtra that is probably modelled on a sentence from the PDhS (cf. p. 235 above). A offers a more convincing reading, especially since, like BhV and T, it also omits the final mention of *ayonija* bodies at the end of the *āhnika*. The section is also coherent without unnecessary repetition in C; T however would be quite cryptic, as both the sūtras which make clear that the second group of sūtras is arguing for the existence of these extraordinary bodies are omitted. From a text-critical point of view, one might suspect that it is just this omission that is original, and that explanatory sūtras were added at different places in different recensions, ŚM then being anomalous in having both, conceivably due to contamination. The general quality of the transmission of T is not high enough, however, for such a bold conclusion to be fully warranted at present.
3. Like ŚM T omits C 4.2.6 \approx BhV 4.2.8 \approx A 4.2.7. Eyeskip (homoeoteleuton) cannot be ruled out; both this sūtra and the preceding one end with °*viśeṣāt*.
4. Like BhV T omits C 6.1.11 *samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ* \approx ŚM 6.1.8 *tasya samabhivyāhārato doṣaḥ* \approx A 6.1.11 *tatsamabhivyāharato doṣaḥ*. There is a possibility that in one or both recensions the omission is due to eyeskip; cf. on BhV footnote 32 on p. 87 and on A p. 288 above.
5. Like A T omits C 6.2.15 \approx BhV 6.2.14 \approx ŚM 6.2.12. This is no evidence for a genetic relationship between the two; A has equivalents of the sūtras that precede and follow this one in C and this omission may have resulted from 'telescoping' of two sūtras (see p. 237 above). T on the other hand omits an

entire group of sūtras (C's 6.2.11–16), replacing them by two which have no relationship with anything in other versions (6.2.12 and 6.2.13; cf. p. 284f. above).

A brief look at the question of organization of the sūtras. Once again, the most interesting point here concerns the last three *adhyāyas*. In these *adhyāyas*, T is the only recension aside from C that has no division into *āhnikas*, a feature which, as remarked above (p. 242) is likely to be ancient. One other detail which must be noted is that the order of T's 2.1.4–5, *apsu śītarā* and *tejasya uṣṇatā*, is the reverse of all other recensions, including A. This looks as if it may be deliberate change, bringing the order of elements mentioned in 2.1.3–5 in line with the order in which they are listed in 1.1.5.

Patterns of other variants of type two and higher on the level of inclusion and omission of sūtras will not be discussed here; the concordance of versions of the VS provided in Appendix 1 will hopefully facilitate the task of those who wish to study these variants in more detail. Instead I now turn to an examination of T on the level of readings of individual sūtras. Some minor variants which stand a good chance of being scribal and are also unlikely to be associated with a different interpretation are not incorporated.

• Sūtras in which T's readings are unique.⁷¹

1. 1.1.5 *prthivy āpas tejo vāyur ākāśaḥ kālo dig ātmā mana itī nava dra-
vyāṇi*. All other versions read *ākāśam* for *ākāśaḥ*. The use of both gen-
ders is well attested. T is the only recension that has the masculine both
here and in 5.2.22, but it is very noteworthy that in 7.1.30 (≈ C 7.1.28 ≈
BhV 7.1.31 ≈ ŚM 7.1.22 ≈ A 7.1.29) all versions attest the masculine.
The discrepancy is likely, I think, to be an old one, perhaps polished
away by a redactor in T. It is not unlikely that it may be taken as a sign
of different historical strata.
2. 1.1.6 *rūparasagandhasparśāḥ saṃkhyā parimāṇāni prthaktrayam
saṃyogavibhāgau paratvāparatve buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣapra-
yatnāś ca guṇāḥ*. For *buddhisukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś* C, BhV
and A have *buddhayaḥ sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś* and ŚM
the same except *prayatnāś* rather than *prayatnāś*. The differences are
minor, but T is likely to be secondary; *sukha* and *duḥkha* or *icchā* and
dveṣa form pairs as natural as *saṃyoga* and *vibhāga* or *paratva* and
aparatva.

71 Note that a separate list is given below (p. 298f.) of readings common to A and T alone.

3. 1.1.9 *dravyāṇy api dravyāntaram ārabhante*. No other source has the *api*, which serves no very clear purpose.
4. 1.2.8 *dravyaguṇakarmabhyo 'rthāntaram sāmānyam*. All other versions read *sattā* for *sāmānyam*. In the context what is meant, in T too, probably has to be 'being' (*sattā* or *bhāva*), not universals in general, for if that were the case several of the subsequent sūtras, arguing that *dravyatva* and so on also must be accepted as distinct from substance and so on, would be rendered largely redundant. If T's reading is indeed hyparchetypal, it is the *lectio difficilior*, though that is not enough for it to have a real claim to being older.
5. 2.1.15 *vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād drṣṭam liṅgam na vidyate*. C, BhV and A⁷² read *vāyur iti sati saṃnikarṣe* for *vāyur iti saṃnikarṣe*, and ŚM only *vāyusaṃnikarṣe*. The *sati* could have been omitted due to scribal error, but the manuscript seems to be consistent (cf. the entry for 2.2.1 below) and has been given the benefit of the doubt.
6. 2.1.23 *saṃyogābhāvād abhāvaḥ karmaṇaḥ*. C, BhV and ŚM unanimously read *saṃyogād* for *saṃyogābhāvād*; A omits the sūtra. T's reading may be simply a mistake, but it is perhaps interpretable; not of course as a general statement applying to all motions according to the Vaiśeṣikas, but as a statement of one possible (and common) reason why a particular motion does not exist/arise, which does not require the postulation of ether as a separate substance.⁷³
7. 2.1.27 *guṇaḥ saṃl liṅgam ākāśasya*. An interesting case; C, BhV and A have only *liṅgam ākāśasya*, with ŚM reading *pariśeṣāl liṅgam ākāśasya*. Candrānanda, however, introduces the sūtra with the words *tasmād guṇaḥ san*. This is one of the more substantial bits of evidence linking T with Candrānanda's commentary (cf. also p. 283 above), though it should not be regarded as conclusive. The words may have been added independently; as with 1.1.4 the resemblance is striking, but given the context it is quite natural to supply something along these lines, and the wording is not very distinctive. One may compare also Kamalaśīla's *ataḥ pāriśeṣyād* (cf. ŚM's reading) *guṇo bhūtvākāśasya liṅgam*

72 Though it should be remembered that the manuscript actually omits *sati*; see footnote 33 on p. 218 above.

73 The general line of the discussion of which this sūtra forms part has to do with the question on what basis ether is postulated to exist. 2.1.20 is clearly to be taken as a *pūrvapakṣa* proposing that it is (motions such as) going out or in that allow the inference of the substance ether, and the following sūtras are devoted to refuting the validity of this as an inferential mark and proposing that instead it is sound that must be regarded as ether's *liṅga*.

(Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā 206.6).

8. 2.2.1 *puṣpavastrayoḥ saṃnikarṣe gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo vastre gandhābhāvaliṅgam*. All other versions have *sati saṃnikarṣe* for *saṃnikarṣe*; ŚM alone has *guṇāntarāprādurbhāvo* for *gandhāntarāprādurbhāvo*. The omission of *sati* is consistent with T's reading in 2.1.15 (cf. the entry on that sūtra on p. 291 above).
9. 2.2.19 *sāmānyapratyakṣād viśeṣāpratyakṣād ubhayaviśeṣasmṛteś ca saṃśayaḥ*. All other versions have *viśeṣasmṛteś ca* for *ubhaya-viśeṣasmṛteś ca*. The latter is obviously a secondary, over-explicit reading.
10. 2.2.22 *yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭam ubhayathādrṣṭatvāt*. If I am right in assuming eyeskip and correcting to this reading, T is alone here. C *drṣṭam yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭam ubhayathādrṣṭatvāt*. BhV reads as two sūtras *yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭam* 2.2.19 and *ubhayathādrṣṭatvāc ca* 2.2.20, and ŚM has *yathādrṣṭam ayathādrṣṭatvāc ca* (a reading which may have been telescoped due to eyeskip).
11. 2.2.28 *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya*. C and A read *acākṣuṣatvān na karma*. BhV is close to T (a rare occurrence): *acākṣuṣatvāc ca pratyakṣasya śabdo na karma*; perhaps T should be corrected to read thus, as the reading as transmitted is almost too elliptical. There is however no apparent cause for the omission. ŚM *nāpi karmācākṣuṣatvāt*. The *pratyakṣasya* seems to me likely to be an addition.
12. 2.2.32 *kāryatvāc ca*. All other versions have merely *kāryatvāt*.
13. 2.2.33 *śabdavyaṅjakābhāvāt*. C *abhāvāt*, A *śabdavyaṅjaka abhāvāt*. It is possible that T should be emended to agree with A, or (less probably) the other way around, but since I cannot rule out either reading as impossible, I have chosen to accept the transmitted text in both cases.
14. 2.2.34 *kāraṇato vikārākāryatvāt*. C, BhV⁷⁴ and A *kāraṇato vikārāt*. ŚM has two sūtras, *anityaś cāyam kāraṇataḥ* 2.2.28 and *na cāśiddhāntaḥ vikārāt* 2.2.29. ŚM is doubtless secondary; the two words of the (probably original) C-BhV-A reading have apparently been supplemented (though in line with an exegesis which differs from both Candrānanda's and Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentaries). I am not certain how T's reading, if it is not corrupt, is to be interpreted.
15. 2.2.38 *dvayoḥ pravṛtṭyor abhāvāt*. All other versions, including A, have *dvayos tu* for *dvayoḥ*. In general, my feeling is that readings with

74 Thus, correctly in my view, in Thakur's edition of the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentary; printed *kāraṇavato vikārāt* in his edition of the short version.

fewer particles as syntactic tags are likely to be more original, i.e. that it is much more frequent that particles are added during the course of transmission to facilitate rapid comprehension than that they are removed. Whether this may be an exception to the general rule it is impossible to say.

16. 3.1.10 *prasiddhabhūtapūrvakatvād apadeśasya*. For *prasiddhabhūta-pūrvakatvād* C has *prasiddhapūrvakatvād* and BhV, ŚM and A *prasi-ddhipūrvakatvād*. The °*bhūta*° may be a scribal error, provoked by the confusing 3.1.9 with its many *bhūtas* and *abhūtas*; if that is the case, T would agree with C alone.
17. 3.2.4 *prāṇāpānanimēṣonmeṣajīvanamanogatīndriyāntaravikārāḥ sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmalingāni*. ŚM and A have *cāmano* for *cety ātmā*°; ŚM is otherwise identical. C and A read *sukhaduḥkhe icchādveṣau prayatnāś* for *sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś*, and BhV *parātmani* for *sukhaduḥkhecchādveṣaprayatnāś cety ātmalingāni*. The compounding is at any rate consistent with the reading in 1.1.6 (see the brief discussion on p. 290 above), though I am inclined to prefer the C and A reading. Cf. also p. 255 above.
18. 3.2.6 *devadatta iti saṃnikarṣe pratyakṣābhāvād drṣṭam liṅgaṃ na vidyate*. For *devadatta iti* C and A read *yajñadatta iti sati*, BhV *aham yajñadatta iti* and ŚM *yajñadatta iti*.
19. 3.2.11 *devadatto gacchati viṣṇumitro gacchatīty upacārāc charīra-pratyakṣaḥ*. Every source has a slightly different reading of this sūtra, though the differences are small. See p. 246 above.
20. 3.2.16 *nānātmāno vyavasthātaḥ*. Another sūtra where everyone differs. C *nānā vyavasthātaḥ*, BhV *sukhaduḥkhajñānaniṣpatyaviśeṣād aikātmīye na vyavasthā* (joined with the previous sūtra), ŚM *vyavasthāto nānā* and A *nānāvasthātaḥ*. Interesting is that T's unique reading is supported by some quotations of the sūtra in commentaries on the PDhS:⁷⁵ Śrīdhara (NK 220.8) and Udayana (KĀ 99.5) have exactly the same form, while Vyomaśīva once quotes it as *vyavasthāto nānātmānaḥ* (Vyo² vol. 1 11.8) and once as *sukhaduḥkhavyavasthāto nānātmānaḥ* (Vyo² vol. 1 153.16). The presence of the word *ātmānaḥ* in the sūtra may therefore be of some antiquity; nonetheless I think it is an addition. One can imagine that the addition of the word would be felt to be desirable particularly if the sūtra was quoted, in situations

75 The PDhS itself refers to the sūtra merely with *vyavasthāvacanāt saṃkhyā* (scil. *ātmagunaḥ*) (70.14–15).

where its context—the discussion of the soul and its qualities which allow one to infer its existence—would not be directly available. It may be possible that T has been influenced by the wording as quoted in Udayana or Śrīdhara's commentary.

21. 4.1.1 *yad akāraṇavat tan nīryam*. This is closest to C's *sad akāraṇavat tan nīryam*; BhV and ŚM read *sad akāraṇavan nīryam*. T's reading is doubtless secondary, though it may be hyparchetypal; with the introduction of the relative pronoun it is the *lectio facillior*.
22. 4.1.4 *nīryam iti ca viśeṣataḥ pratiśedhābhāvaḥ*. Other versions have the negative in a different place: C (and A) *anīryam iti ca viśeṣapratīśedhābhāvaḥ*, ŚM *anīrya iti viśeṣataḥ pratiśedhābhāvaḥ*. BhV does not appear to have the sūtra. T makes equal sense, and is perhaps 'easier' in that *nīryam* is mentioned a few sūtras earlier, at 4.1.1 (see above).
23. 4.2.3 *manaātmasaṃyogas tv avipratīśiddho mithaḥ pañcānām*. Cf. the brief note on A's 4.2.3 at p. 247 above. The unique and interesting feature of T is the *manaātmasaṃyogaḥ* where C, BhV and A have only *ātmasaṃyogaḥ* and ŚM *aṇusaṃyogaḥ* (if his 4.2.4 is not regarded as a different sūtra rather than a variant). The sūtra, and especially the word *ātmasaṃyogaḥ* forms something of a problem for Candrānanda, who resorts to interpreting *ātman* as *svarūpa* here. The order of words in the compound in T is suspicious, since at other places we always find *ātmamanah*⁷⁶.
24. 5.1.7 *saṃyogābhāve na gurutvāt patanam*. I am not at all certain that this reading is hyparchetypal, and if it is, there is a certain inconsistency with the wording of later sūtras, 5.1.13 and 5.2.13. Other possibilities would be *saṃyogābhāvena gurutvāt patanam*, which would also be anomalous, or simply correcting to agree with the other versions, which have *saṃyogābhāve gurutvāt patanam*. The last makes for the greatest consistency in wording; I have hesitated from choosing for this mainly because there is no clear reason for the added *ābhāva*; the carelessness of our scribe seems to manifest itself frequently in the omission of *akṣaras* but the only other insertions are such as are clear cases of dittography or the like.
25. 6.2.4 *upadhā ca*. C and A⁷⁷ (*cāturāśramyam*) *upadhāś cānupadhāś ca*.⁷⁷ BhV *upadhānupadhāś ca*, ŚM *cāturāśramyam upadhā anupa-*

⁷⁶ C reads as one sūtra together with the previous one, and it is possible that A should do so, too.

⁷⁷ Jambūvijaya prints *cāturāśramyam upadhāś cānupadhāś ca* in his edition of C but I believe it to be an error resulting from misreading of the Śāradā ligatures *ś ca* and *ś ca*.

dhās ca. It is quite possible that the T reading is a result of eyeskip. The singular, however, is in itself perhaps more logical than a plural.

26. 6.2.16 *karmasu mokṣo vyākhyātaḥ*. All other recensions have *ātma-karmasu* for *karmasu*. There is no visible cause for a mechanical error; *ātma*⁷⁸ may have been omitted to avoid drawing attention to the difficulty the 'classical' Vaiśeṣika has with references in the sūtras to motions of the soul. With simply *karmasu* the sūtra would presumably be taken as a reference to the fifth *adhyāya* in general.
27. 7.1.12 *aguṇavato dravyasya guṇāntarārambhāt karmaguṇā aguṇāḥ*. C,⁷⁸ A and possibly BhV⁷⁹ read *guṇārambhāt* for *guṇāntarārambhāt*, while ŚM does not have the sūtra. T has what may be called the *lectio faciliior*.
28. 7.2.14 *yutasiddhyabhāvāt kāryakāraṇayoḥ saṃyogavibhāgā na vidyante*. All other versions have the expected dual *saṃyogavibhāgau na vidyete*.
29. 7.2.17 *ubhayopagamanābhāvān niṣkriyatvāt*.⁸⁰ All other versions, including A, read merely *niṣkriyatvāt*. The addition is clearly explanatory, and in fact recalls the *ubhayor gamanaṃ nāsti* with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra introduces the sūtra.
30. 7.2.18 *asti nāstīti ca prayogāt*. C, ŚM and A (BhV lacks the sūtra) read *asati nāstīti ca prayogāt*. T's *asti* may be an involuntary corruption, but it seems interpretable, and it is therefore conceivable that it belongs to the hyparchetype.
31. 7.2.23 *adrṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*. All other recensions that have an equivalent (ŚM does not), whether as a separate sūtras as in C (and, arbitrarily, in A) or joined with the preceding one as in BhV, read *drṣṭatvād ahetuḥ pratyayaḥ*. The present reading could well be a simple scribal error, but on the other hand, such is the obscurity of the entire passage, it makes perhaps just as good sense. For example, Candrānanda explains

⁷⁸ Or rather, J₁ and J₁^S; note that the Śāradā manuscripts read *guṇāntarārambhāt* as in T. The Jaina manuscript has been accepted here by both Jambūvijaya and myself, chiefly because the commentary has *aguṇasya dravyasyaivoppannasya kāraṇaguṇair guṇā janyante* (53.12), but the presence of the T reading in the Śāradā manuscripts may suggest that it too was at least known in Kashmir.

⁷⁹ This is somewhat hypothetical: see footnote 37 on p. 111 above. It is also conceivable that Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra knew T's reading instead.

⁸⁰ It should be noted that Isaacson 1995, 759 wrongly reports T as reading *ubhayopagamanān* rather than *ubhayopagamanābhāvān*.

his equivalent 7.2.21 as meaning that the examples given by an opponent in the preceding sūtra—in support of his thesis that word and object must be connected because we have cognition of an object from a word—fail to prove the point, because with the cow and its horn, for instance) the two are actually seen to be connected, but the connection between word and object is not seen. Clearly T's reading would be possible and slightly easier as an answer to the preceding sūtra with basically the same intention: it could be rendered 'because [a connection between word and object] is not seen [in the way the connections in the examples given in 7.2.22 are], the cognition [of an object from a word] is not a valid inferential mark [to prove that word and object are connected].'

For further remarks on possible interpretations of the entire passage with particular reference to Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's readings see the edition and translation of his commentary on 7.2.22–23 in part 1 above.

32. 8.9 *samavāyīśvairyaḥ chvairya buddheḥ śvete buddhis te kāraṇakāraṇa-bhūte*. For *samavāyī*⁸¹ all other versions have *samavāyīnaḥ*. Here the compounding is likely to be secondary; apart from its poor attestation it removes what might be felt as a lack of symmetry by making both ablatives into genitive tatpuruṣas. For *te* ŚM alone reads *te* etc.
33. 8.10 *dravyeṣv anitaraviśeṣāt*. This looks like a telescoping of what in other versions is two sūtras. C *dravyeṣv anitaratarakāraṇāḥ*⁸² *kāraṇāyauḥ* *apadyāt* 8.10, *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇaviśeṣāt* 8.11. BhV *dravyeṣv anitaratarakāraṇāḥ pratyayāḥ kāraṇāyauḥ* *apadyāt* 8.11.⁸³ *tathā dravyaguṇakarmasu kāraṇaviśeṣāt* 8.1.12. ŚM *dravyeṣv anitaratarakāraṇāḥ* 8.1.10, *kāraṇāyauḥ* *apadyāt* *kāraṇakramāc ca śhaṭapaṭāḍibuddhīnām kramo na hetuḥ* *phalabhāvāt* 8.1.11. But T cannot be explained merely by eyeskip, for we would then expect the element that caused the error, the (')*kāraṇā*', to be found once. And T's reading seems interpretable as an argument for the proposition put forward in the following sūtra (though that may admit for more than one interpretation); a possible reading of the two, which if this is correct could equally well be combined as a single sūtra, would be 'Because with respect to

81 Read thus for the '*kāraṇāt*' printed by Jamhōvijaya of Issachen 1935, 7.2 footnote 31, and footnote 25 on p. 150 above.

82 The *kāraṇakramāc ca śhaṭapaṭāḍibuddhīnām kramo na hetuḥ* *phalabhāvāt* is added after the square brackets by Thakur is another unnecessary adoption of an anomalous reading in ŚM which there is no reason to think was known to Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra. It has doubtless entered at Śaṅkara Miśra's sūtrapāṭha from the explanation of *kāraṇāyauḥ* *apadyāt* in some commentary.

the substances [involved] there is no difference from [what is denoted by] the other [words], [references to the same person by different pronouns and in different cases, as when we say] ‘this [person],’ ‘that [person],’ ‘you should eat’ [and so on] are dependant on cognition [i.e. have a subjective element].’ Things would be smoother perhaps if we correct at least to *dravyeṣṣu anitaretaraviśeṣāt*, assuming haplography, and there is no doubt no serious objection to that.

34. 8.11 *ayam eṣa tvayā bhojanīyam iti buddhyapekṣam*. In omitting the word *kṛtam* T is relatively closest to A and BhV, both of which read *bhojayainam* for *bhojanīyam* (cf. p. 255 above). T may represent a corruption of this reading; the reverse is less likely, since *bhojayainam* is also found in C and ŚM.
35. 8.16 *tathāpas tejo vāyuś ca rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*. For *rasarūpasparśeṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt* C reads *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*, BhV *rasarūpasparśajñāneṣu* (with *rasarūpasparśāt* as a separate sūtra), ŚM *rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt* and A *rasanādiṣu rasarūpasparśaviśeṣāt*; see the brief discussion on p. 251 above. T’s reading does not inspire much confidence.
36. 9.6 *asati bhūtapratyakṣābhāvāt smṛter virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca*. The *asati* for *asad iti* in all other versions stands a very good chance of being a scribal error. I have tentatively let it stand unamended, though, as it seems conceivable that it could be interpreted. The ending of the sūtra differs slightly from what we find elsewhere, with *virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca* where C and BhV have *virodhipratyakṣatvāc ca jñānam*, the Sena court version *virodhipratyakṣatvāj jñānam* and ŚM *virodhipratyakṣavat*.

• Sūtras in which T shares a reading with C against BhV and ŚM.

1. 1.2.4 *bhāvaḥ sāmānyam eva*. BhV (and A) have merely *bhāvaḥ*, and ŚM *bhāvo ’nuvṛtter eva hetutvāt sāmānyam eva*. Cf. p. 254 above.
2. 2.2.12 *ita idam iti yatas tad diśo lingam*. BhV and A (cf. p. 254 above) reads *diśāṃ* and ŚM *diśyaṃ* for *diśo*. The singular of A and C is more logical than a plural, for there is but one substance space—note the singular (in all versions) in the list of substances at (T) 1.1.5, and at (T) 5.2.26—and it is that substance which is the subject here, not the directions.⁸³

⁸³ Further confirmation for the *diśo*, though that may be thought unnecessary, may be found in the fact that it is with this word that the sūtra is quoted by Kamalaśīla (*Tattvasaṃgrahapañjikā* 207.4) and Abhayadevasūri (*Tattvabodhavidhāyinī* 669.12).

3. 2.2.36 *saṃyogād vibhāgāc chabdāc ca śabdāniṣpattēḥ*. BhV, ŚM and A have *śabdāniṣpattiḥ* for *śabdāniṣpattēḥ*, and ŚM further has *ca śabdāc* for *chabdāc*. I feel the reading of C and T here is not convincing: Candrānanda accounts for the ablative by adding by way of *avatarāṇa* the words *kutaḥ kāryatvam* (scil. *śabdāṣya ity āha* (23.1) but there is nothing in the sūtras to justify it.
4. 3.1.11 *viśāṇī tasmād aśvo viśāṇī tasmād gaur iti ca*. T has been restored here, assuming that the omission of *viśāṇī tasmād aśvo* in the manuscript is due to homoeoteleuton. A has the same except for omitting the final *ca*; see further p. 245 above.
5. 3.2.10 *yadi ca dr̥ṣṭapratyakṣo 'haṃ devadatto yajñadatta iti*. See p. 246 above.
6. 7.1.7 *etena nītyeṣv anītyatvam uktam*. See for variants and discussion p. 253 above.

• Sūtras in which T shares a reading with BhV alone.

1. 1.1.24 *dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pr̥thaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca*. C and A *dvitvaprabhṛtayaś ca saṃkhyāḥ pr̥thaktvam saṃyogavibhāgāś ca*. ŚM *dvitvaprabhṛtayaḥ saṃkhyāḥ pr̥thaktvasaṃyogavibhāgāś ca*. The differences are small and the variant not likely to be of textual significance.

• Sūtras in which T shares a reading with ŚM against C and BhV

1. 3.2.3 *prayatnāyauḡapadyāj jñānāyauḡapadyāc caikam*. Thus also A; see p. 245 above.

• Sūtras in which T shares a reading with A alone.⁸⁴

1. 1.1.25 *asamavāyāt sāmānyam kāryam karma na vidyate*. See the brief comment on A 1.1.24, p. 243 above.
2. 1.2.9 *ekadravyatvān na dravyam*. See the comments on A 1.2.9, p. 243 above.
3. 1.2.12 *ekadravyatvena dravyatvam uktam*. See the note on A 1.2.12, p. 243 above.
4. 2.1.11 *adravyatvād dravyam*. See the note on A 2.1.11, p. 244 above.

⁸⁴ Another striking resemblance between A and T, though the readings are not identical, is found in 2.2.33; cf. p. 292 above.

5. 2.1.12 *kriyāvattvād guṇavattvāc ca*. See the comments on A 2.1.12, p. 244 above.
6. 2.2.10 *nityeṣv abhāvād anityeṣu ca bhāvāt*. See the brief comment on p. 244 above.
7. 2.2.25 *tasmin dravyaṃ guṇaḥ karmeti saṃśayaḥ*. Cf. pp. 240 and 244 above.
8. 3.1.13 *pravṛttinivṛttī pratyagātmani dṛṣṭe paratra līṅgam*. Cf. p. 245 above.
9. 4.1.6 *mahaty anekadravyatvād rūpāc copalabdhiḥ*. Cf. the note on A 4.1.6, p. 247 above. Note that T's text has been restored, assuming eye-skip in the manuscript; cf. footnote 57 on p. 283 above.
10. 6.1.6 *taṃ tu kramo yathānītaretarāṅgabhūtānām*. See the brief comment on p. 249 above.
11. 7.2.29 *kāraṇaparativāt kāraṇāparativāc ca parativāparatve*. The rather over-explicit addition of *parativāparatve*—lacking in the versions of the commentaries—may have been independent in A and T.
12. 9.5. *yac cānyat sataś tad asaś*. It will be remembered that A's reading is very uncertain here; see the brief comment on p. 252 above.

3.3.6 Evaluation

Briefly, despite the mangled state in which the sūtras are preserved in this manuscript, I think it possible to assert with confidence that the hyparchetype contained a version of the VS significantly different from any other. And, again, it is very implausible that it should have descended from one of the other recensions. Of the recensions on which we have commentaries, though, T is on the whole closest to C, though this is so to a less pronounced degree than with A. As remarked above, the insertions in T are particularly interesting; though often tantalizingly obscure, they afford brief glimpses of arguments which do not seem to be attested in other Vaiśeṣika sources. They are however also a sign that the *sūtrapāṭha* of T has been 'tampered with' to a greater extent than A; in general T seems to have more 'individuality' than A, but to preserve fewer potentially original readings. Nonetheless there are some readings which deserve serious consideration, and the fact, for example, that T is the only recension to agree with C in its organization of the final three *adhyāyas* should serve to remind us that even a generally unreliable line of transmission of a text may preserve archaic features that are lost in versions which are in most respects superior.

3.4 Conclusion

The pages above represent, or so it is to be hoped, only the beginning of the study of manuscripts of the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS. It is hoped that they have succeeded in demonstrating that A. and even T despite its evident faults, should be consulted in any investigation of the sūtras and their exegesis and development.

Finally, it should be stressed that I have by no means made an exhaustive search for manuscripts with the *sūtrapāṭha* of the VS. It may I think be regarded as certain that a really dedicated effort to find such manuscripts will turn up many more, and it is quite likely that some of these will, like the two I have treated here, prove to be independent of the versions transmitted to us together with a commentary. One factor which may render the unearthing of *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts more difficult is that it is to be expected that as with the two treated briefly above, many will prove to contain the VS as only one of a number of texts, and often not as the first. Such 'Sammelhandschriften' run a greater risk than normal to be inadequately catalogued, as it is necessary to go through them with some care to note all the texts contained therein, for which many harried cataloguers faced with daunting numbers of manuscripts may well not spare the time.

Other representatives of the A and T recensions would be very welcome indeed, but it would not be very surprising if still further different versions of the *sūtrapāṭha* come to light. The search for *sūtrapāṭha* manuscripts, and indeed for any other Vaiśeṣika texts which may survive in hitherto unnoticed manuscripts, remains, in my view, among the most urgent priorities.

APPENDIX 1

CONCORDANCE OF THE RECENSIONS OF THE VS

The publication over the past forty years or so of various recensions of the VS differing from that of Śaṅkara Miśra, which till then had held sway as the only version which needed to be seriously taken into account, has been a blessing which brought with it one minor drawback—gradually things have reached the stage that only perhaps the most resolute and knowledgeable explorer does not occasionally lose his way in the ever denser jungle of variant readings and different numberings. Some charts have, it is true, been published which provide a degree of help in this confusion—one may mention Honda's *A Reading in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra* of 1990 and especially Nozawa's *A Comparative Table of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra* of 1985. Nonetheless even Nozawa's work, for all that it has saved me and doubtless many others time and trouble, has its drawbacks in that it perpetuates certain mistakes particularly in the *sūtrapāṭha* of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra.¹

Having been guilty myself of increasing the complexity of the situation yet further by the publication here of tentative reconstructions of two further versions of the VS, I feel it incumbent on me to make what amends I can, and have chosen to do so by offering here a tabular concordance of all the recensions that are presently available. In it, separate columns have been reserved not only for BhV—i.e. the *sūtrapāṭha* followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra as far as it can be determined now, with the aid of Thakur's edition of the fragments of the long version of the commentary and with consultation of the manuscript of the abridged version—but also for the earlier attempts to reconstruct this version, i.e. that given in Thakur's edition of the abridged version of the commentary (siglum BhV_T), that in the second *pariśiṣṭa* of Jambūvijaya's edition of the VS with Candrānanda's commentary (siglum BhV_J), and that given by Nozawa (siglum BhV_N).² The numbering given by Tha-

1 Note that in this publication Nozawa refers to the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary as 'anonymous' and does not discuss its relation with Bhaṭṭa Vādindra. Earlier, in his article dealing with the *sūtrapāṭha* associated with this (version of the) commentary (1974), Nozawa appears to accept Thakur's judgement that it is an abridgement of the long commentary by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra, but with some reservations.

2 Something about the merits of these various attempts has been said in the introduction to Part 1.

kur for the portions of the *sūtrapāṭha* contained in the fragments he has published of the full version of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's commentary has been left out of the concordance though: it seemed unnecessary to reserve yet another column for on account of this incomplete and seldom referred to³ numbering of the *sūtrapāṭha*. I regret that I have not felt ready at present to give the actual *sūtrapāṭha* as followed by Bhaṭṭa Vādindra itself: many problems on the level of wording remain, which still require further deliberation.⁴ This table has thus a more limited aim than Nozawa's or than Honda's *Reading*: those publications provide not merely a concordance but all readings as well.⁵

The left hand column gives a continuous numbering: only those sūtras which were in my view wrongly supposed to be part of Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's *sūtrapāṭha*, and which are not attested by other versions in the same place, have not been allotted a number.

Concordance of recensions of the VS									
Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₊	BhV ₊	BhV ₊	SM	S	A	T
<i>Adhyāya 1 āhnika 1</i>									
1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
2	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
3	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
4						4			
5									4
6	4	4	4	4	4	5		4	5
7	5	5	5	5	5	6		5	6
8	6	6	6	6	6	7		6	7
9	7	7	7	7	7	8		7	8
10						9			
11	8	8	8	8	8	10a		8	9
12	9	9	9	9	9	10b		9	10

pp. 48ff. Note that in the BhV₊ column I have followed the method Nozawa used in his 1974 article to number sūtras which were not printed as such in Thakur's edition, i.e. at 1.2.4-1 and so on. In the *Comparative Table* of 1985 Nozawa does not give these sūtras a number, but only an asterisk.

- 3 The only scholar I am aware of who seems to have made use of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasūgama* at all is Halbfass, and I have not noticed any places where he refers to a sūtra by the numbering given therein.
- 4 Aside from the portions reedited in Part I, I have given a number of emendations and corrections to Bhaṭṭa Vādindra's *sūtrapāṭha* at various places in this thesis, particularly in Part I.
- 5 Honda's work is not quite a full concordance, as he does not provide numbering for each individual version, instead merely stating under each sūtra whether one or other recension is attested or has variants and what those variants are. He also has not taken the *ratnamūlaka* of the 'Samyukt' commentary, given by Thakur in his 1945 article, into account. On the other hand, he has helpful supplementary material, such as occasional reference to citations of the sūtras in other texts and to secondary literature.

[illegible]

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₁	BhV ₂	BhV ₃	SM	S	A	T
53	18	18	16	17	16	17		18	19
<i>Adhyāya 2 śloka 1</i>									
54	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
55	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
56	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
57	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4
58	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5
59	6	6	6	6	6	6		6	6
60	7	7	7	7	7	7		7	7
61	8	8	8	8	8	8		8	8
62	9	9	9	9	9	9		9	9
63	10	10	10	10	10	10		10	10
64	11	11	11	11	11	11		11	11
65	12	12			12	12		12	12
66	13	13	12	12	12	13		13	13
67	14	14	13	13	13	14		14	14
68	15	15	14	14	14	15		15	15
69	16	16	15	15	15	16		16	16
70	17	17	16	16	16	17		17	17
71	18	18	17	17	17	18		18	18
72	19	19	18	18	18	19		19	19
73	20	20	19	19	19	20		20	20
74	21	21	20	20	20	21			21
75	22	22	21	21	21	22			22
76	23	23	22	22	22	23			23
			23 ⁶		23 ⁶				
77	24a	24	24	23	24	24		21	24
78	24b	25-26	25-26	24-25	25-26	25		22	25
79	25	27-29	27-29	26-28	27-29	26		23	26
80	26	30	30	29	30	27		24	27
81	27	31	31	30	31	28		25	28
82	28	32	32	31	32	29		26	29
83						30			
84						31			
<i>Adhyāya 2 śloka 2</i>									
85	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
86	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
87	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
88	4	4	4	4	4	4		4	4
89	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5

6 This sūtra should be regarded as a quotation in Bhāṭa Vāṇīśvara's commentary (1.2.2.2⁶) and not as the same words occurring twice as different sūtra. Cf. the brief discussion in footnote 16 on p. 233 above.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV _r	BhV _j	BhV _N	SM	S	A	T
90	6	6	6	6	6	6		6	6
91	7	7				7		7	7
92	8	8				8		8	8
93	9	9	7	7	7			9	9
94	10	10	8	8	8	9a		10	10
95	11	11	9	9	9	9b		11	11
96	12	12	10	10	10	10		12	12
97	13	13				11		13	13
98	14	14	11	11	11	12		14	14
99	15	15	12	12	12	13		15	15
			13		13				
			14		14				
100	16	16	15	13	15	14		16	16
101	17	17		14		15		17	17
				15					
102	18	18	16	16	16	16		18	18
103	19	19	17	17	17	17		19	19
104	20	20	18	18	18			20	20
105	21	21				18		21	21
106	22	22-23	19-20	19-20	19-20	19		22	22
107	23	24	21	21	21	20		23	23
108	24	25	22	22	22	21		24	24
109	25							25	25
110	26	26				22		26	26
111	27	27	23	23	23	23		27	27
112	28	28	24	24	24	24		28	28
113	29	29	25	25	25	25		29	29
114	30	30	26	26	26	26		30	30
115	31	31	27	27	27	27		31	31
116	32	33			28+1			32	32
117	33							33	33
118	34	32	28	28	28	28-29		34	34
119	35	34	29	29	29	30		35	35
120	36	35	30	30	30	31		36	36
121	37	36	31	31	31	32		37	37
122	38	37	32	32	32	33		38	38
123	39	38	33	33	33			39	39
124	40					34		40	40
125	41	39	34	34	34	35		41	41
126	42	40	35	35	35	36		42	42
127	43a	41	36	36	36	37		43	43
128	43b							44	44

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₁	BhV ₂	BhV ₃	SM	S	A	T
129	43c ⁷	42	37	37	37			45	45
<i>Adhyāya 3 āhnikā 1</i>									
130	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
			2	2	2				
131	2	2	3	3	3	2		2	2
132	3	3	4	4	4	3		3	3
133	4	4	5	5	5	4		4	4
134	5	5	6	6	6	5		5	5
135	6	6	7	7	7	6		6	6
136	7	7	8	8	8	7		7	7
137	8 ⁸	8	9	9	9	8		8	8
138	9	9	10-16	10	10-16	9-13		9	9
139	10	10	17	11	17	14		10	10
140	11	11	18	12	18	15a		11	
141	12	12	19	13	19	15b		12	
142	13					16-17		13	11
143	14	13	20	14	20	18		14	12
144	15	14	21	15	21	19		15	13
<i>Adhyāya 3 āhnikā 2</i>									
145	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
146	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
147	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
148								4	
149	4	4	4	4	4	4		5	4
150	5	5	5	5	5	5		6	5
151	6	6	6	6	6	6		7	6
152	7	7	7	7	7	7		8	7
153	8	8	8	8	8	8		9	8
154	9	9	9	9	9	9		10	9
155	10	10	10	10	10	10		11	10
156						11			
157	11			11		12		12	11
158	12	11	11	12	11	13		13	12

7 On Candrānanda's 2.2.43 see the brief discussion in footnote 55 on p. 232 above.

8 I add this, with some hesitation, as it is present in J₁ of the *śādhināṭaka* of Jambhavya's edition, p. 228-229. It is difficult to be certain whether Candrānanda's new text, as Jambhavya writes, *atra candrānandaracūṣavīter ādārād āve tathāhīti śāstrakṛmāṃ pṛatītiśīma arthāntarasyānapadeśāt* 'in sūtram caṣitam ādāre candrānandaracūṣavīter ādārāt' (228 14-20). It is easy to imagine that the sūtra, and perhaps some commentary thereon, has been lost in both J₁ and the Sarāḍī manuscript tradition; on the other hand there remains a suspicion that it may have been added in J₁ by a transmitter who knew the sūtra from a different version of the VS. As a result of my accepting it into Candrānanda's tradition, the numbers given under C here are one higher than in Jambhavya's edition, until the end of this *āhnikā*.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV _T	BhV _J	BhV _N	SM	S	A	T
159	13	12	12	13	12	14		14	13
160						15			
161						16			
162	14	13	13	14	13	17		15	14
163						18			
164	15	14a	14a	15	14a	19		16	15
165	16	14b	14b		14b	20		17	16
166	17					21		18	17
<i>Adhyāya 4 āhnika 1</i>									
167	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
168	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
169	3	3	3	3	3	3		3	3
170	4					4		4	4
171	5	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
172	6	5	5	5	5	6		6	6
173	7	6	6	6	6				7
174	8	7	7	7	7	7			8
175	9	8				8			9
176	10	9	8	8	8	9		7	10
177	11	10	9	9	9	10		8	11
178	12	11	10	10	10	11		9	12
179	13	12	11	11	11	12		10	13
180	14	13	12	12	12	13		11	14
<i>Adhyāya 4 āhnika 2</i>									
181						1			
182	1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1
183	2	2	2	2	2	3		2	2
184	3	3	3	3	3	4		3	3
185		4	4	4	4				
186		5	5	5	5	5		4	
187	4	6	6	6	6	6		5	4
188	5	7	7	7	7	7		6	5
189	6	8	8	8	8			7	
190	7	9	9	9	9	8		8	6
191	8	10	10	10	10	9		9	7
192	9a					10			8
193	9b					11		10	9
<i>Adhyāya 5 āhnika 1</i>									
194	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
195	2					2		2	2
196	3	2	2	2	2	3		3	3
197	4	3	3	3	3	4		4	4
198	5	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
199	6	5	5	5	5	6		6	6

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₁	BhV ₂	BhV ₃	SM	S	A	T
200	7	6	6	6	6	7		7	7
201	8	7	7	7	7	8		8	8
202	9	8	8	8	8	9		9	9
203	10	9	9	9	9	10		10	10
204	11	10	10	10	10	11		11	11
205	12					12		12	12
206	13	11	11	11	11	13		13	13
207	14	12	12	12	12	14		14	14
208	15	13	13	13	13	15		15	15
209	16	14	14	14	14	16		16	16
210	17	15	15	15	15	17		17	17
211	18	16	16	16	16	18		18	18
<i>Adhyāya 5 āhnika 2</i>									
212	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
213	2					2		2	2
214	3	2	2	2	2	3		3	3
215	4								
216	5	3	3	3	3	4		4	4
217	6	4	4	4	4	5		5	5
218	7	5	5	5	5	6		6	6
219	8	6	6	6	6	7		7	7
220	9					8		8	8
221	10	7	7	7	7	9		9	9
222	11	8	8	8	8	10		10	10
223	12	9	9	9	9	11		11	11
224	13	10	10	10	10	12		12	12
225	14	11	11	11	11	13		13	13
226	15					14		14	14
227	16-17	12-15	12-15	12-15	12-15	15-16		15-16	15-16
228	18	16	16	16	16	16		17	17
229	19	17	17	17	17	17		18	18
230	20	18	18	18	18	18		19	19
231	21	19	19	19	19	19		20	20
232	22			20		20		21	21
233	23	20	20	21	20	21		22	22
234	24	21	21	22	21	22		23	23
235	25	22	22	23	22	23		24	24
236	26			24		24		25	25
237	27	23	23	25	23	25		26	26
238	28	24	24	26	24	26		27	27
<i>Adhyāya 6 āhnika 1</i>									
239	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
240	2	2	2	2	2			2	2
241	3	3	3	3	3	2		3	3

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV _T	BhV _J	BhV _N	SM	S	A	T
242	4	4	4	4	4	3		4	4
243	5	5	5	5	5	4		5	5
244	6	6	6	6	6			6	6
245	7	7	7	7	7	5		7	7
246	8	8	8	8	8			8	8
247	9	9	9	9	9	6		9	9
248	10	10	10	10	10	7		10	
249	11					8		11	
250	12	11	11	11	11	9		12	
251	13	12		12		10		13	10
252	14					11		14	11
253	15					12		15	12
254	16	13	12	13	12	13		16	13
255						14			
256	17	14	13	14	13	15		17	14
257	18	15	14	15	14	16		18	15
<i>Adhyāya 6 āhnika 2</i>									
258	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
259	2	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
260	3a	3	3	3	3	3a		3	3
261	3b	4	4	4	4	3b		4	4
262	4	5	5	5	5	4a		5	5
263	5	6				4b		6	6
264	6	7	6	6	6	5		7	7
265	7	8	7	7	7	6		8	8
266	8	9	8	8	8	7		9	9
267	9	10	9	9	9	8a		10	10
268	10					8b		11	11
269	11	11	10	10	10	9		12	
270	12	12	11	11	11	10		13	
271	13					11		14	
272	14	13	12	12	12			15	
273	15	14	13	13	13	12			
274		15	14	14	14				
275	16	16	15	15	15	13		16	
276									12
277									13
278	17	17				14		17	14
279	18	18-19	16-17	16-17	16-17	15		18	15
280	19	20	18	18	18	16		19	16
<i>Adhyāya 7 āhnika 1</i>									
281	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
282	2	2		2	1+1			2	2
283	3	3		3	1+2			3	3

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₁	BhV ₂	BhV ₃	SM	S	A	T
284	4	4		4	1+3	2		4	4
285	5	5		5	1+4			5	5
286	6	6		6				6	6
287	7	7	2	7	2	3		7	7
288	8	8	3	8	3	4		8	8
289	9	9	4	9	4	5		9	9
290	10a	10	5	10a	5	6a		10a	10a
291	10b	11	6	10b	6	6b		10b	10b
292	11a	12	7	11	7			11a	11a
293	11b	13		12	7+1			11b	11b
294	12	14	8	13	8			12	12
295	13	15	9	14	9			13	13
296	14	16	10	15	10	7		14	
297									14
298									15
299	15	17	11	16	11	8		15	16
300	16	18	12	17	12	9		16	17
301	17	19		18	12+1	10		17	18
302	18	20	13	19	13	11		18	19
303	19	21	14	20	14	12		19	20
304	20	22	15	21	15	13		20	21
305	21	23	16	22	16	14		21	22
306						15			
307	22	24	17	23	17	16		22	23
308	23	25	18	24	18	17		23	24
309	24a	26	19	25	19			24	25
310	24b	27	20	26	20			25	26
311	25	28	21	27	21	18		26	27
312						19			
313	26	29	22	28	22	20		27	28
314	27	30	23	29	23	21		28	29
315	28	31a	24a	30a	24a	22a		29	30
316	29	31b	24b	30b	24b	22b		30	31
317	30	32	25	31	25	23		31	32
318	31	33	26	32	26	24		32	33
319	32	34	27	33	27	25		33	34
<i>Adhyāya 7 āhnika 2</i>									
320	1a	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
321	1b	2	2	2	2	2		2	2
322	2	3		3	2+1			3	3
323	3	4		4				4	
324	4	5	3	5	3	3		5	
325	5a	6	4	6	4			6	4
326	5b	7	5	7	5			7	5

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV _T	BhV _J	BhV _N	SM	S	A	T
327	6	8	6	8	6	4		8	6
328						5			
329	7	9	7	9	7	6		9	
330	8	10	8	10	8	7		10	7
331	9	11	9	11	9	8		11	8
332	10	12	10	12	10	9		12	9
333	11	13	11	13	11	10		13	10
334	12	14	12	14	12	11		14	11
335	13a	15	13	15	13	12a		15	12
336	13b	16	14	16	14	12b		16	13
337	14	17	15	17	15	13		17	14
338	15	18		18	15+1	14		18	15
339	16	19	16	19	16	15		19	16
340	17	20	17	20	17	16		20	17
341									18
342									19
343	18					17		21	20
344	19	21	18	21	18	18		22	21
345	20	22a	19a	22a	19a	19		23	22
346	21	22b	19b	22b	19b			24	23
347									24
348	22	23		23a	19+1a			25	25
349	23	24		23b	19+1b			26	26
350									27
351	24	25	20	24	20	20		27	28
352	25	26	21	25	21	21		28	29
353	26	27	22	26	22	22		29	30
354	27	28	23	27	23	23		30	31
355	28a	29	24	28	24	24		31	32
356	28b	30	25	29	25	25		32	33
357	29	31	26	30	26	26		33	34
358	30	32	27	31	27	27		34	35
359	31	33	28	32	28	28		35	36
<i>Adhyāya 8</i>									
360	1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1		1.1	1
361	2	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2	2
362	3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3		1.3	3
			1.3		1.3				
363	4a	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4		1.4a	4a
364	4b	1.5		1.5	1.4+1			1.4b	4b
365	5	1.6 ⁹				1.5		1.6	5

9 This sūtra is absent in the manuscript of the abridged version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's commentary, but is quoted in a discussion in the full version: see p. 28 above and footnote 75 there.

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV ₁	BhV ₂	BhV ₃	SM	S	A	T
366	6	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.6		1.6	6
367	7	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7		1.7	7
368	8	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8		1.8	8
369	9	1.10	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9		1.9	9
370	10a	1.11a	1.9	1.10a	1.9	1.10		1.10	10
371	10b	1.11b	1.10a	1.10b	1.10a	1.11a		1.11	
372			1.10b		1.10b	1.11b			
373	11	1.12		1.11	1.10+1			1.12	
374	12	1.13	1.11	1.12	1.11	2.1		1.13	11
375	13	1.14	1.12	1.13	1.12	2.2		1.14	12
376	14	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.3		1.15	13
377	15	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4		2.1	14
378	16	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.5		2.2	15
379	17	2.4-5	2.4-5	2.4-5	2.4-5	2.6		2.3	16
<i>Adhyāya 9</i>									
380	1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1	1	1
381	2					1.2	2	2	2
382	3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	3	3	3
383	4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	4	4	4
384	5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	5	5	5
385	6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	6	6	6
386	7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	7	7	
387	8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	8	8	7
388	9					1.9	9	9	8
389	10					1.10	10 ¹¹	10	9
390	11						[11]	11	10
391	12						[12]	12	11
392	13					1.11	[13]	13	12
393	14					1.12	[14]	14	13
394	15						15	15	14
395						1.13			
396	16					1.14	16	16	15
397	17					1.15	17	17	16
398	18					2.1	18 ¹²	18	17
399						2.2			

- 10 After this a folio is lost in the unique manuscript of S. I have assumed that it is most probable that the following four sūtras attested by C, A and T also belong in this *sūtrapāṭha*, and have given them numbers, though placed withing square brackets. Thakur instead continues by numbering the next sūtra preserved (15 in the numbering here) 11, and similarly the subsequent sūtras 12-18 have numbers in his edition lower by 4 than the numbers given here.
- 11 After this the manuscript of S is again defective; though a fair amount of commentary on this sūtra is preserved there are a number of folios missing before the next one which contains a sūtra. Again I assume the presence in the *sūtrapāṭha* of those sūtras which are unanimously attested by other versions and allot them bracketed numbers; as a result sūtras 22-29 have numbers in

Nr.	C	BhV	BhV _T	BhV _J	BhV _N	ŚM	S	A	T
400	19					2.3	[19]	19	18
401	20					2.4	[20]	20	19
402	21					2.5	[21]	21	20
403	22					2.6	22	22	21
404	23a					2.7	23	23	22
405	23b					2.8	24	24	23
406	24					2.9	25	25	24
407	25					2.10	26	26	25
408	26					2.11	27	27	26
409	27					2.12	28	28	27
410	28					2.13	29	29	28
<i>Adhyāya 10</i>									
411	1						1	1.1	1
412	2					1.1	2	1.2	2
413	3					1.2	3	1.3	3
414	4					1.3	4	1.4	4
415	5						5	1.5	5
416	6						6	1.6	6
417	7						7	1.7	7
418	8					1.4	8	1.8	8
419	9					1.5	9	1.9	9
420-1 ¹²	10-11					1.6-7	10-11	1.10-11	10-11
422	12					2.1	12	1.12	12
423	13					2.2	13	1.13	13
424	14					2.3	14	1.14	14
425	15					2.4	15	1.15	15
426	16					2.5	16	1.16	16
427	17					2.6	17	1.17	17
428	18					2.7	18	1.18	18
429	19						19	1.19	19
430	20					2.8	20	2.1	20
431	21					2.9	21	2.2	21

Thakur's edition lower by 7 than they have here.

- 12 ŚM and S on the one hand and C, A and T (the latter two only conjecturally) divide into two sūtras at different places.

APPENDIX 2

CONCORDANCE OF MANUSCRIPTS OF CANDRĀNANDA'S COMMENTARY

The following table gives folio and line references to the beginnings of the various subdivisions of the VS in the manuscripts of Candrānanda's commentary, and references to the corresponding pages in Jambūvijaya's edition, for which the siglum E_j is used.

Concordance

VS	J_1^S	J_1	J_2^S	J_2	\dot{S}_1	\dot{S}_2	\dot{S}_3	E_j
1.1	1v1	6r12	1r1	3v18	6r1	1v2	22r15	1
1.2	1v11	9v3	1r10	5v13	8r27	4r18	24r8	8
2.1	2r3	10v3	1r15	6r18	9r15	5r11	24v5	11
2.2	2r12	12v7	1v3	7v9	11r4	7r4	25v7	16
3.1	2v10	15r12	1v13	9r12	13r23	9r27	26v21	25
3.2	3r3	16v1	1v18	9v16	14v2	10r21	27r19	28
4.1	3r9	18r6	2r5	10v18	16r13	11v14	28r5	32
4.2	3v2	19r1	2r10	11r17	17r3	12r23	28r22	35
5.1	3v4	19v3	2r13	11v11	17v4	12v23	28v8	36
5.2	3v11	20v11	2r19	12v3	18v13	13v25	29r10	40
6.1	4r9	22v11	2v9	13v11	20v5	15r28	30r10	45
6.2	4v2	24r4	2v14	14r18	21v11	16r20	30v10	48
7.1	4v7	25r9	2v19	15r7	23r4	17r14	31r11	52
7.2	5r4	27r2	3r17	16r7	24v15	18v6	32r4	57
8	5v2	29r1	3r17	17r12	26v2	20r7	33r3	62
9	5v8	30v1	3v3	18r7	27r20	20v19	33r22	66
10	6r4	32v11	3v11	19v5	29v4*	22r18*	34r21*	72

* All \dot{S} manuscripts omit the beginning of 10; cf. p. 149 above.

APPENDIX 3

ON THE TEXT-CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE PDhS

1 Recent work on the text of the PDhS

In an important article published a decade ago, in 1985, Marui drew attention—for the first time, as far as I know—to the fact that the text of the *Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha* (also known as *Padārthapraveśa(ka)* or *Praśastapādabhāṣya*)¹ poses textual problems which still demand considerable attention. He opens by making the following observations.

It is a century since the text of Praśastapāda's *Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha* or *Praśastapādabhāṣya* was edited for the first time. Yet, as is the case with the majority of the texts of Indian Philosophy, very little attention has been paid to the textual problems of this most important work of Vaiśeṣika system. Of course, there cannot be the least doubt that the transmission of *Praśastapādabhāṣya* is far better than that of *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (= VS). When one compares various editions of *Praśastapādabhāṣya* (= PBh) with one another, one may not find such "big" differences as one does among various versions of VS. It must be admitted, however, that the task of textual criticism cannot be avoided even for this "apparently" well-preserved text, at least when its testimonial value with reference to VS is brought under consideration. (Marui 1985, 106)

Anyone who seriously occupies himself with Vaiśeṣika studies cannot but be in agreement with these words, though I should add that in my view the qualification expressed in the last sentence is hardly necessary; it is by no means only when references to the VS are concerned that the text of the PDhS requires critical attention. Later in the article Marui makes some further remarks which I should like to call attention to and with which I once more wholly concur in all material points.

1 On the various names by which we find the PDhS referred to see Chemparathy 1969.

Thus, although the number of the editions of *PBh* that have come out is, one should say, relatively large, yet the task of collecting MSS has not been done much, especially since V [i.e. Dvivedin's 1895 edition] was issued. It does not mean however, that the need for studying MSS is not great. On the contrary, what has ever been done for establishing the *PBh* text is far from satisfactory. (Marui 1985, 110)

In this way, the text of *PBh* has not yet been fully established; in other words, the critical (in the true sense of the word) edition of *PBh* still remains a desideratum. Since I cannot afford to venture upon an independent research of all the MSS, I must content myself by making the following remark as a sort of summary: in the context where the choice of correct reading is crucial, one should take the trouble to collect all the alternative readings possible out of the four editions of *PBh*, i.e., L [i.e. Kṛṣṇaśāstrin's edition],² V, B and G, and in doing so, one should give heed to, above all, the reading(s) attested to by the three commentators, i.e., Vyomaśiva, Śrīdhara and Udayana, while at the same time taking into account the possibility of the *PBh* text having been transmitted through different lineages at the times of those commentators. (Marui 1985, 111)

Fortunately, Marui's article appears to have been paid due heed, for since its publication more than one scholar has done useful work towards improving the situation. As a preliminary to offering some fresh observations I shall briefly review and attempt to assess the relevant publications, as far as they are known to me.³

First of all, one must mention Tanaka's article of 1987, in which he gives a transcription of a birch-bark manuscript in Śāradā script preserved in Kashmir University (I refer to this manuscript in the following with the siglum Ś₁). In the very brief introduction to the transcription he observes, without referring to Marui's article, that 'unfortunately, although we have various editions of *PDS*, one can not say the task of collating MSs have [sic] been done satisfactorily,' a remark which is certainly true, though the explanation immediately given, '[i]t is due to the fact that almost all MSs of *PDS* are either incomplete or quite indistinct' (Tanaka 1987, 1) is one which is very unlikely to do justice to all the factors involved. The manuscript transcribed in this article is indeed an important one, and Tanaka points out that it was not used in any of the editions. A few folios from the manuscript are reproduced in the article, and it is thus possible to establish that Tanaka's transcription is on the whole

2 There is a certain bibliographic confusion about the edition referred to here. An attempt to clear it up is made below, in footnote 16 on p. 320.

3 Despite expectations which might be raised by its title, S. Peeru Kannu's *The Critical Study of Prastapādabhāṣya*. Delhi 1992, has no claim to be included in the survey below.

reasonably reliable.⁴ At just a few places errors or what may be presumed to be errors in the transcription lead one to doubt whether Tanaka's understanding of the text is very precise;⁵ there are also a large number of word-divisions, or absences of word-divisions, which reinforce this doubt.⁶

In 1990 a very useful tool for the (text-)critical study of the PDhS was made available by the publication of a word-index to the frequently used Dvivedin edition of the PDhS. This was compiled by Honda, to whom we owe many other works of the same useful and self-effacing nature, and included as an appendix to his Japanese translation of the PDhS together with Śrīdhara's *Nyāyakandalī*.

In 1991 Tanaka published a second article of relevance to the manuscript transmission of the PDhS. The main part of this publication consists of a transcription of the *dravya* section of the PDhS from two manuscripts; the same birch-bark manuscript he had transcribed in its entirety in 1987 and another manuscript, on the same material and in the same script, from the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (my siglum Ś₂). Tanaka begins however with the following paragraph.

A good many Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Padārthadharmasamgraha* (PDS), also called *Praśastapādabhāṣya* or *Padārthapraveśa* are kept in many educational institutes in India and elsewhere. According to

- 4 There are—inevitably perhaps—some inaccuracies and mistakes. For instance, in the transcription of f. 6r the *daṇḍa* after *parimāṇam* in line 2 should be deleted, in line 4 Tanaka does not report that the scribe clearly first wrote *sarvopalabdhinimittam* and corrected this to *śabdopala-bdhinimittam* (as transcribed) by cancelling *sarvo* and adding *śabdo* above the line, and in line 7 the MS has a double, not a single, *daṇḍa* after *iii*. There are a few places where Tanaka's transcription is probably a misreading which cannot be checked, as the relevant folios are not reproduced. For instance in the very last line of the final colophon (f. 40v10) *vighuhante* is I suspect a misreading by Tanaka of *vighnahantre*, rather than a mistake of the scribe in a phrase which he almost certainly did not copy but formulated himself.
- 5 Thus at f. 6v10–11 *paramarṣibhiḥ=cruṣṭismṛtilokasamvyavahārārtham* (Tanaka uses = to indicate that there is a word-break, but that the manuscript has a ligature) for *paramarṣibhiḥ=śruti*° which is undoubtedly what the scribe wrote (the ligatures *śś* and *śc* are virtually indistinguishable in Śāradā script), and, in the transcription of a marginal note on f. 2r *vijāṭṭyetyo* (which is senseless) for *vijāṭṭyebhyo*; in the second case the folio is fortunately reproduced and it can be clearly determined that the latter is what was actually written, despite the admitted resemblance between the ligatures *ry* and *bhy* (and indeed between *t* and *bh* in general) in Śāradā script.
- 6 For instance, to give only a few examples, at f. 1v4 *ca śabdasamuccitāś=ca* for *caśabdasamuccitāś=ca*, at f. 2r4 *dravyatvādyaparam* for *dravyatvādy=aparam*, at f. 2r5–6 *sāmānyam sadvi-śeṣākhyaṁ* for *sāmānyam sad=viśeṣākhyaṁ*, at f. 2r8 *iha pratyayahetuḥ* for *iha pratyayahetuḥ* (the same mistake is repeated in the transcription at f. 39r10–11), at f. 3r9 *saptasāṅkhyādayaḥ* for *sapta saṅkhyādayaḥ*, at f. 3v2–3 *anapeksyaśukraśonitam* for *anapeksya śukraśonitam*, at f. 5v12 *ayāvad=dravyabhāvitvād* for *ayāvaddravyabhāvitvād*, at f. 6v12–13 *savinurye saṁyogālokapālapariṅhātadikpradeśānām* for *savitur=ye saṁyogā lokapālapariṅhātadikpradeśānām* and so on.

various catalogues, the total number of manuscripts is about one hundred. It is a very difficult task to collect and compare them all. However, I have so far collected 36 manuscripts in microfilms or in photo-stats and have made a comparison between them. I am now engaged in codifying them. (Tanaka 1991, 1)

The article also includes a list of the thirty-six manuscripts referred to, with a few details (Tanaka 1991, 3).

The transcription is again reasonably reliable,⁷ as far as representation of the *akṣaras* in the manuscript is concerned, but, like the one Tanaka had published earlier, it frequently errs in the matter of word-division. None of the mistakes of this kind in the 1987 article (cf. footnote 5 on p. 317 above) have been corrected in the transcription of the same manuscript given anew here.

A far more important shortcoming must be noted, however, which did not play a significant role in the case of Ś, as far as I can tell, but which seriously reduces the value of the transcription of the BORI manuscript. This is that Tanaka fails to indicate the many places where there are corrections written also in Śāradā script but by a second, in my view clearly later, hand.⁸ In such cases Tanaka merely gives the text as corrected, though there is no remark made on this fact.⁹ To illustrate: in the description of *vāyu* Tanaka transcribes from Ś, (f. 4r7) *tatra kāryalakṣaṇaś caturvidhaḥ*. There is no way a reader without access to the manuscript could know that the word *tatra* has been inserted in the margin by a second hand. Again, on the same side (f. 4r10), Tanaka transcribes *prthivyādyanabhibhūtair vāyavayavair ārabdham sarvaśarīravypī tvagindriyam* without indicating that *sarva*¹⁰ is an inter-linear addition by the later hand.

The presence of corrections of this type is in itself something which it is very important to note. I have no doubt that it points to the manuscript having been collated at some time against another manuscript of the PDhS. A further indication pointing to the same conclusion is the fact that at some places the first scribe left an open gap, doubtless because his exemplar was lacunose at that place, which has been filled in (appropriately) by the second hand.¹⁰ This too has gone unmentioned by Tanaka.

- 7 The article contains no reproductions of the newly collated manuscript. I have been able to consult it from photographs, thanks to the friendly help of Mr. F. Janssen and Dr. J.E.M. Houben.
- 8 These corrections are probably written by the same person who has added some marginal annotation, not mentioned or transcribed by Tanaka.
- 9 Neither here nor in his 1994 book does Tanaka introduce any convention to indicate syllables or words as having been secondarily added, nor are there any footnotes on his transliterations, which he describes as 'literal' and 'unamended' (1991, 4).
- 10 For instance at f. 5v2, where the first scribe wrote *vi*, left a gap, and continued *paramamahat*. The later hand filled up the gap from another source, writing in the missing '*bhavavacana*'. On the same side, in line 8, he has completed the word *bādhiryam* by adding the '*dhirya*' for which

All this means that we have a record of conflation taking place almost in front of our eyes, and Tanaka's failure to report accurately what the manuscript's readings were before as well as after correction has the serious consequence that his transcription cannot be reliably used in determining the relation between the manuscripts.¹¹

A treatment of the section on inference in the PDhS, containing the Sanskrit text with variants based on four editions, was published in 1992 by Nenninger. The book, a revised version of a M.A. thesis presented at the University of Hamburg, has as its chief aim an investigation of the *trairūpya* doctrine particularly as set forth in Praśastapāda's work.¹² As a presentation and evaluation of Praśastapāda's theory of inference, Nenninger's work is very successful, combining accuracy with clarity in a way that is far too rare.¹³ Though it was clearly not his intention to (re)examine the PDhS section on inference from the standpoint of textual criticism, in his efforts to arrive at a precise understanding of what the Indian author says, Nenninger, not surprisingly perhaps, noticed places where the text, or a reading of a particular edition, seemed 'wrong,' and has pointed out such cases,¹⁴ though he did not allow himself to be distracted from his main concerns into an attempt to arrive at a solution to these difficulties. It is therefore a subsidiary merit of his book to have increased our awareness of the need for further text-critical work on the PDhS.

In an article that appeared in 1994, a revised version of a paper presented in Vienna at the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference in 1990, I drew attention at two places to textual problems of the PDhS, also referring to Marui's article. In footnote 13 on p. 146, after justifying a correction to the printed editions,¹⁵ I wrote: 'While this particular question of word order is relatively unimportant, it may serve as yet

a space had been similarly left blank.

11 See on this point and its methodological consequences p. 333ff. below.

12 Nenninger himself uses the following words (among others) to explain the goals of his book. 'Daß wir [i.e. Nenninger and his supervisor Oetke] uns... zur Veröffentlichung meiner Arbeit entschlossen haben, hat mehrere Gründe. Zum einen wird die Interpretation der *trairūpya*-Lehre hier am konkreten Beispiel des Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha ausführlich dargestellt. Dies mag für all jene Leser von Interesse sein, welche sich auch in anderer Weise mit Praśastapāda befassen. Außerdem erleichtert der mögliche Rückbezug auf den in seiner Gesamtheit wiedergegebenen Textabschnitt das Verständnis der doch recht komplexen und schwierigen *trairūpya*-Interpretation. Dieses Buch versteht sich somit als eine Einführung in die indische Logik' (Nenninger 1992, vii).

13 Cf. the review by Bronkhorst in *Asiatische Studien* 1993 [appeared in 1994], 703–707.

14 See especially p. 34 n. 20, p. 38 n. 41 and p. 91; note also the slight doubt expressed by Nenninger at p. 50 n. 87.

15 At the time I wrote the words 'all editions of the PDhS available to me read °*paramāṇuvāyu*°' (1994, 146 n. 13) I had no access to the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin edition, which has the reading °*vāyuparamānu*° which I proposed. From the Bronkhorst/Ramseier collation it appears that it is the only edition that reads thus.

another illustration of the need for a new and more critical edition of the PDhS, a labour which the present author has undertaken and hopes to complete in the near future.' It should be remarked that at the time these words were written I was unaware of Tanaka's article of 1991.

Two important book-length publications also appeared in 1994. Bronkhorst and Ramseier jointly produced a *Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya*, subtitled a *complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Neither the title nor the sub-title does full justice to the contents of the book, for aside from the word-index, which covers pp. 89–169, we find also the complete text of Praśastapāda's work (pp. 1–88) with an apparatus containing all the variants obtained from a collation of the twelve editions known to them¹⁶ as well as some

- 16 A certain amount of bibliographic confusion with regard to the extant editions of the PDhS has arisen from conflicting reports in various publications. Nine editions were listed by Marui, who divides them into four 'in editing which manuscripts were made use of' (1985, 107) and five which are not based on manuscripts (1985, 109–110). He could not of course refer to the 1991 edition (with the *Nyāyakandālī*) by Jetly and Parikh, and he also does not make use of the 1983–1984 two-volume edition (with the *Vyomavālī*) by Gaurinath Shastri. Neither of these seems to draw on fresh manuscript evidence for the text of the PDhS: if I am not mistaken all the manuscript readings in the Jetly/Parikh edition are already found in Jetly's 1971 edition (with the *Kiraṇāvalī*). The only edition in Marui's list that cannot be directly matched with one used by Bronkhorst and Ramseier is described by Marui as 'Edited, with VS, by Kṛṣṇaśāstri. Lahore 1890' (1985, 107). Tanaka also lists nine editions (1994, xvi), eight of which are again easily identified, and describes the third on the list as '*Vaiśeṣikadarśanam of Śrī Kaṇādamuni, with Praśastapādabhāṣya of Praśastapādācārya. Ed. by Śrī Kṛṣṇa Śāstri, Sanskrit Book Dept., Lahore, 1921/22.*' Bronkhorst and Ramseier have used a different Lahore edition, dated 1889, with a title-page (transcribed by Bronkhorst and Ramseier, p. xiv) mentioning the presumed editor with the words *śrīmatpaṇḍitalekharājena mahatā parīśramenānveṣitam*. They also describe an edition by Śrīkṛṣṇaśāstrin in the following way: '*Vaiśeṣikadarśanam. Śrīkaṇādamunipraṇītam. Jālandharavaidīkapāṭhaśālamukhyāvyāpaka*" śrīkṛṣṇaśāstrinirmitatippaṇṣa-malaṃkṛtaṃ praśastapādācāryaviracitaṃ tadīyabhāṣyam. ŚRĪKṚṢṆAŚĀSTRINā saṃskṛtaṃ. Bombay: Nirmaya Sāgara Press 1943' (1994, xiv). All this might well give the impression that four different editions are concerned. This is not the case. At any rate the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin editions referred to by Marui and by Bronkhorst and Ramseier are in fact identical. The apparent discrepancy has arisen from the fact that neither Marui nor Bronkhorst and Ramseier have described the publication completely accurately. Marui's account being particularly sketchy. Bronkhorst and Ramseier have transcribed almost all the information on the title-page, but have omitted some important points. After *śrīkṛṣṇaśāstrinā saṃskṛtaṃ* | there is a line in English reading '*All Rights reserved with the Sanskrit Book Depot Lahore.*' Furthermore, after the place of publication is given (*mumbayyām*) we read *lavapurīyasamskṛtapustakālayādhyakṣena mihiracandrena nijā dhikārato "nirmayasāgarākhyā" yantrālaye mudrayirvā prasiddhau nilam* |. Most importantly, the date is then given as *śakābdaḥ 1812 saṃvat 1946*. The publication therefore appeared not in A.D. 1946, as one would suppose from the information given by Bronkhorst and Ramseier but in 1889/1890: exactly when cannot be determined without a month-date. This is then doubtless the same as Marui's 'Lahore 1890' edition, and is indeed based on three manuscripts, like the edition Marui describes. I suspect strongly that it is also the same as the edition Tanaka

gleaned from the three oldest commentaries, and with what amounts to a complete concordance of all the editions, in the form of marginal page-references. Though Bronkhorst and Ramseier say virtually nothing about the text they give, it is abundantly clear that it has no pretensions to be a critical edition, and is mainly given simply to be able to conveniently refer to in the word-index. As far as I can see, their policy has been to give the readings of the 1966 edition by Śrī Nārāyaṇa Miśra (their siglum *M*) in the main body of the text; at least this is the only siglum that does not seem to occur in the apparatus.

Compared with Honda's word-index, the work of Bronkhorst and Ramseier, taking the readings of all the editions into account, has many advantages. The word-index is considerably more detailed than Honda's, and it is also very much to be welcomed that one can actually read the text¹⁷ and have the variants available in the apparatus; of course one has to remain aware while doing so that one will have to make one's own decisions on the value of the various readings.

Finally, another important publication by Tanaka, likewise dating from 1994, has been kindly brought to my attention by Dr. J.E.M. Houben, whom I must also thank for providing me with photocopies of a portion of the book. It seems to consist of nothing less than a complete collation of the *dravya* section of the PDhS of thirty-four of the thirty-six manuscripts listed in Tanaka's 1991 article.¹⁸ The preface (also dated 1994) reads as follows.

A good number of Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha* (PDhS) or the *Praśastapādabhāṣya* has been preserved in the institutions in and outside of India. They have facilitated the critical studies of this important work of Vaiśeṣika philosophy. However, although we have various editions of this work, one cannot say that the task of collating manuscripts have [sic] been done satisfactorily. It is due to the fact that those editions have been edited on the basis of the

refers to, though I cannot explain the error in the date, and it is possible that Tanaka's book is a reprint.

* An unfortunate misunderstanding of this phrase has led to Potter's *Bibliography* giving the name of the editor as Lekharaja Mahat Parisrama (1983, 28 no. 490). Incidentally Potter's *Bibliography* does not list the Kṛṣṇaśāstrin edition.

** This is a mistranscription for ° *mukhyādhyaṇḍhāpaka*°.

17 I have noticed only one significant error in the text given; on p. 44 (§234) for *tatrākṣam akṣam sotpadyata iti pratyakṣam* read *tatrākṣam akṣam prātīyotpadyata iti pratyakṣam*. Fortunately this has not led to a corresponding mistake in the word-index.

18 Quite mysteriously, nos. 16 and 17 of the list given in Tanaka 1991 (p. 3) are not mentioned in the more detailed list of collected manuscripts in Tanaka 1994, xi–xv, though a place has been left open for them, so to speak, as the numbering given there jumps from 15 to 18. They are also not incorporated in the collated transcriptions, as far as can be judged from the three pages thereof available to me in photocopies.

manuscripts of the *Nyāyakandalī* and *Kiraṇāvalī*, which are the commentary [sic] on PDhS, and a few manuscripts of PDhS as the materials.

In 1979, a research group in Kashmir Buddhism of Bukkyo University brought photo copies of many manuscripts from Kashmir. Among them, we could find out the manuscript of the *Padārthapraveśa* which is another name of PDhS. Throughout our comparative study of the manuscript with various editions, we came to know that no edition has so far dealt with this manuscript.

At this point, we decided to re-edit the PDhS by using this manuscript. In addition to that, we have been provided a number of manuscripts of PDhS from many places of India as reader can see in the list of collected manuscripts.

We have undertook the project of editing a critical text of PDhS. The present work is the first part of the romanized text of PDhS manuscripts. Its principal aim lies in providing fundamental materials for further critical and systematic studies of PDhS. (Tanaka 1994, iii)

From this it appears that the volume (and the volumes which are announced as forthcoming, containing collations of the manuscripts Tanaka has collected for the rest of the text of the PDhS) is in the nature of preliminary work for a critical edition. This is again suggested by the remark, on p. vi, that '[t]his romanized text is a sort of a report of the long process which is not accomplished yet.'

At the time that I started to work towards a critical edition of the PDhS I was aware of Tanaka's 1987 article but did not know that he was and had been doing preparatory work with a view to the same goal. At the University of Hamburg, in the summer-semester of 1992, I read through and discussed a draft edition of the *dravya* section and the beginning of the *guṇa* section with Prof. Dr. A. Wezler, Mr. D. Goodall and Mr. C. Nenninger, to all of whom I am very much indebted for suggestions and critical comments which have stimulated my reflections on individual as well as methodological problems.

Having become aware of the extent of Tanaka's work, I have for the present postponed trying to finish my edition. I have a high opinion of the value of Tanaka's labours on the manuscripts of the PDhS, and regard his published collations as useful for anyone reading Praśastapāda's work, as well as being of interest as a collection of material casting light more generally on the *usus scribendi* of Indian scribes and the transmission of texts. Unfortunately, as long as Tanaka continues to fail to report both readings *ante correctionem* and *post correctionem* (cf. p. 318 above), the usefulness of his work has an important limitation.

As yet it is impossible to say anything of the critical edition that appears also to be pending; none of Tanaka's publications that I have seen discusses in any detail the relationship between the manuscripts,¹⁹ the use of the commentaries in establishing the text, other testimonia for the text of the PDhS, or indeed the general problems involved in attempting to edit Praśastapāda's work critically. Presumably we may expect all this to be touched upon as Tanaka's work progresses. In the meantime, I shall offer a few observations based on my experience in working with the problems of the PDhS.

2 Sources for a critical edition of the PDhS

2.1 The manuscript tradition

It is not clear how many manuscripts of the PDhS are in existence at present. In 1991 Tanaka had collected copies of thirty-six MSS and estimated on the basis of manuscript catalogues that the total number is about a hundred (Tanaka 1991, 1; see p. 317 above). In his 1994 publication, Tanaka gives a 'List of Collected Manuscripts' (xi–xv) which contains thirty-four of the thirty-six he had mentioned in the earlier article (cf. footnote 18 above), together with eighteen additional manuscripts, all deposited in the Sampūrṇānanda Saṁskṛta Viśvavidyālaya, in Vārāṇasī. These additional manuscripts are not however included in the actual collations. In total, this amounts therefore to fifty-two manuscripts. He further adds a 'Catalogue list of *Padārthadharmaśaṅgraha*' (xvi–xviii); this has, as he tells us, been taken over from vol. 11 of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (NCC), pp. 109–110 (s.v. *Padārthadharmaśaṅgraha*) with '[s]ome added by us' (Tanaka 1994, xvi). This lists thirty-four catalogues (some unpublished) which apparently contain 63 entries,²⁰ but allowing for overlapping (the same manuscript being described in different catalogues) the number of manuscripts involved is probably 59. The list does not include the additional 21 manuscripts listed in vol. 13 of the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (published in 1991) s.v. *Praśastapādabhāṣya*.

19 Perhaps it should be pointed out that here and in the following, when I speak of 'the relationship between the manuscripts' or use similar expressions I usually mean what could more precisely be expressed as 'the relationship between the states / versions of the text found in the manuscripts.' It may be important in many contexts to distinguish strictly between the manuscripts themselves and the states of a text that they record; cf. especially Dearing 1983, 1–8 and the (in my opinion very well-judged) critical remarks thereon in Tanselle 1990, 284–288. For the very limited purposes of a preliminary consideration of the problem on hand, however, I think it sufficient to concentrate in the main on textual states, while finding it less cumbersome to frequently use 'manuscript' as a short-hand for 'textual state preserved in a manuscript.'

20 I have not counted item 17 from Tanaka's list, which seems to concern only a 'scroll... containing titles of Sanskrit works with author-names' which presumably mentions the PDhS.

Moreover, as Tanaka indicates (1994, vi), many manuscripts of the PDhS have not been catalogued, while others have been wrongly catalogued.²¹ Without being able to be at all definite, I think it is to be expected that the number of manuscripts in existence is in fact well in excess of a hundred, perhaps closer to two hundred.

Such a number of manuscripts obviously in itself already poses very considerable practical problems for an editor. It should be noted, however, that only a small percentage of these manuscripts contains the text of the PDhS more or less complete. Out of the fifty-two manuscripts collected by Tanaka thirty-two contain only of the *dravya* section, in whole or in part. Though Tanaka understandably enough calls these 'incomplete,' my own examination of the manuscripts in his list which are available to me as well as some others shows that in many of these cases the end of the manuscript is preserved and it is clear that it was never intended to contain the entire work. Most of Tanaka's 'incomplete' manuscripts are therefore probably complete in the sense that nothing has been lost, even though they do not contain the complete text of the PDhS.

This state of affairs, which at first sight might well seem curious, probably reflects the changing position of the PDhS in the curriculum of traditional studies. It agrees with the fact that, while the oldest three surviving commentaries on the work covered the entire text,²² the two commentaries which belong to a (considerably) later period, the *Sūkti* of Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra and Padmanābha Miśra's *Setu*, only go up to the end of the section on substances. At what point this change in emphasis took place I cannot say,²³ but it is likely to reflect the loss of interest in 'old' Vaiśeṣika. The detailed discussions of especially the *guṇa* section of the

21 The Bodleian Library's MS Sansk. d. 171, described in M. Winternitz and A.B. Keith *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Vol. II* (Oxford 1905), p. 202b, no. 1331, as '*Dravyapadārtha*, a Vaiśeṣika work on the category *dravya* or substance,' is in fact, as the extract given there reveals, another manuscript of the *dravya* section of the PDhS. This seems to have been overlooked by the compilers of the NCC as well as by Tanaka. It is quite likely that some of the other manuscripts listed in the NCC s.v. *Dravyapadārtha* will also prove to contain the *dravya* section of the PDhS.

22 In the case of the *Kiraṇāvalī* it is I think safe to assume that Udayana's intention was to do this, though he was prevented, probably by death, from completing the work. At any rate his commentary is not confined to the *dravya* section.

23 The oldest dated manuscript of the *dravya* section alone that has been collected by Tanaka is his no. 20, from the L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, with a date (*samvat* 1638) corresponding to A.D. 1581/1582 rather than A.D. 1580 as given by Tanaka (1994, xii). There are several which are less than half a century younger, e.g. his no. 12 and MS 5306 of the University of Kerala Manuscripts Library (not examined by Tanaka), which is dated *vikramasamvat* 1663, *śaka* 1528 (A.D. 1606/1607). Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra's floruit is placed at c. A.D. 1620 (cf. Potter 1983, 393) and that of Padmanābha Miśra at c. A.D. 1650 (cf. Potter 1983, 417), so it is evident that in treating the *dravya* section alone these scholars were following rather than initiating a trend.

PDhS must have been gradually superseded by the new ideas (and interests) of the 'new school' of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika; the *dravya* section with its more elementary nature apparently remained a popular item on the curriculum, and this inevitably had an important effect on the manuscript tradition of the text.

With so many manuscripts surviving of what clearly was a popular and much studied work throughout the whole of India²⁴ over a period of more than a millennium, it is no more than to be expected that the text should have been transmitted with a very large number of variants. Even though only a small proportion of the manuscripts has been collated as yet, it is already evident that this is indeed the case. The problems that the editor faces in dealing with this mass of variants need to be considered; but before that, attention should be given to sources which are admittedly 'secondary' but which nonetheless are of great importance.

2.2 The evidence of the commentaries

Marui has very rightly emphasized the importance of taking the evidence of the early commentaries on the PDhS into consideration, and has himself demonstrated their value in establishing the text. Bronkhorst and Ramseier are also aware of this, and in the preface to their work Bronkhorst has the following to say.

A third feature that distinguishes this Word-index is the attempt that has been made to note readings recorded in the three oldest commentaries (Kiraṇāvalī, Nyāyakandalī, Vyomavati) which deviate from editions *Ki.*, *Ny.* and *Vy.* respectively. Where our text does not refer to these commentaries in the footnotes, it may be assumed that either the reading recorded in the commentary concerned agrees with the corresponding edition, or that the commentary contains no clear indication as to what reading it accepts.

The information provided with regard to the readings accepted in the commentaries has to be treated with the greatest care. It is rarely pos-

- 24 There are manuscripts of the PDhS in most of the major Indian scripts, though Devanāgarī and Bengali manuscripts predominate. Thirty-two of the fifty-two manuscripts collected and described by Tanaka are written in 'Nagari', fourteen in Bengali script, two in Śāradā script and one each in Maithili, Assamese, Grantha, Telugu scripts. There are also Malayalam manuscripts in existence, for instance a old palm-leaf manuscript of the complete text in the Kerala University Manuscripts Library (no. 34). So far I know of no manuscripts of the PDhS in Oriya or Kannada scripts.

* Tanaka does not distinguish between Jaina and non-Jaina Devanāgarī; several of the manuscripts he indiscriminately labels as 'Nagari' are in fact written in Jaina Devanāgarī and by Jain scribes. This includes the oldest dated manuscript known to either Tanaka or myself, no. 782 of 1875/76 in the BORI, dated *saṃvat* 1578 (A.D. 1521/1522), which is referred to occasionally in the following by the siglum J₁.

sible to reconstruct with certainty the exact reading of the original with the help of a commentary. Moreover, different mss. of one commentary do not always agree with each other, and may attribute different readings to the *Praśastapādabhāṣya*. Our notes in this respect are therefore tentative and provisional, and no more than that. (Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994, ix)

What Bronkhorst and Ramseier have done is very worth-while, and they are the first to try and do it for the whole text. It is something of a pity though that, as Bronkhorst says, when one finds no mention of the reading supported by a commentary in the notes, there are two possibilities: either the commentary supports the reading in the corresponding edition or it does not allow determination of the *mūla* reading followed. After all, the difference between the two is a significant one, especially where the editions do not agree. For this reason, a reader who wishes to pursue the textual problems of a given passage will still often have to determine the position of the commentators for himself.

The cautionary remarks that Bronkhorst makes are judicious ones. It may be useful to add something further to them here. It is true that the reconstruction of a *mūla* text from a commentary thereon is a very difficult and uncertain task, though there are a few cases in which it has been attempted with what may be hoped is a certain degree of success.²⁵ As far as I know there have been no studies of the general methodological problems involved. One should in my opinion try to distinguish between kinds or degrees of support for a reading in the *mūla*: the evidence of a *pratīka* quoted in the commentary I would call weak support, and other cases where a word appears in a particular form in the course of a discussion are also usually inconclusive, as it may not have been the commentator's intention to use precisely the same form he finds in the *mūla* text. It is in the case of this type of 'weak' evidence, especially that of *pratīkas*, that the problem Bronkhorst draws attention to, viz. that 'different mss. . . may attribute different readings' to a *mūla* seems most often to occur. A possible explanation for this is that when there is nothing in the commentary to ensure the reading and interpretation of a quoted passage a transmitter of the text may substitute a reading more familiar to him, whether from memory or from a manuscript of the *mūla*.

Negative evidence, that is to say absence of support, can be important and quite strong sometimes, especially in the case of elements of which there is already some other reason to suspect that they are inserted.

Certain kinds of commentatorial explanation can be reckoned as providing considerably stronger support than *pratīkas*. An example of what I would put in this

25 Most famously in the case of Mallavādin's *Dvādaśāraṇayacakra*, reconstructed by Muni Jambūvijaya from Simhasūri's commentary alone, in the absence of any manuscripts of the *mūla* text.

category may be taken from Marui's 1985 article. At an important point in the account of perception in the PDhS, a long compound listing the causes of perceptual knowledge of a substance is printed in most of the editions as *anekadravyavattvodbhūtarūpaprakāśacatuṣṭayasannikarṣāt*. Marui comments:

However, a close look at the way each commentator paraphrased this portion would disclose that the word "*udbhūta*" was absent in the text known to them. Decisive are the explanations: "*rūpaṃ cātra rūpaviśeṣo vivakṣitaḥ*" (Vy.2); "*rūpasya prakāśa udbhavasamākhyāto rūpasya dharmah*" (Nk.2); "*rūpaṃ codbhūtasvabhāvam*" (Ki.2). These comments would hardly be understandable if they had been intended for paraphrasing "*udbhūtarūpa*". Thus, the attestation of the commentators evidently supports... the wording which is recorded only in the long-neglected edition, L. (Marui 1985, 116)²⁶

In cases such as this one, the chance that the text of the commentaries has been tampered with is considerably smaller, though it is perhaps necessary to be always aware of the possibility.

This example was one in which the commentaries unanimously support a particular reading. In his article Marui, as we saw above (p. 316), spoke of the possibility that different 'lineages' (i.e., presumably, recensions) of the PDhS existed already at the time of the commentators, though he remarked that 'without a thorough examination of all the MSS of *PBh*, one cannot possibly give a definite answer as to whether there existed different lines of transmission of *PBh* at all' (Marui 1985, 111). This seems to be unnecessarily cautious, and Bronkhorst and Ramseier have in their notes drawn attention to some cases where the commentaries support different readings, though usually without specifying the nature of the support.²⁷ This

26 In 1990, before I was aware of Marui's article, I arrived at substantially the same conclusions (Isaacson 1990, 64–65). Preisendanz too went over the same ground independently, in a paper presented at the panel on early Vaiśeṣika in the 34th ICANAS, Hong Kong, August 1993. In Isaacson 1994, 153 n. 25 I observed that the manuscript tradition of the PDhS, as far as I had studied it up to that point, also supports the same reading that the commentators must have had. The most thorough discussion of the entire problem of the introduction of the concept of *udbhūtarūpa* in the Vaiśeṣika will be found in Preisendanz 1995.

Somewhat surprisingly, in view of Bronkhorst's statements quoted on p. 325 above, the notes to the Bronkhorst/Ramseier edition contain no comment on the fact that the commentators clearly had a different reading from the PDhS text together with which they are printed.

27 Though they do not discuss the general question of different kinds or levels of support, Bronkhorst and Ramseier are clearly aware of it, at some places indicating uncertainty by a formulation using words such as 'probably' (e.g. p. 1 n.8) or 'appears to' (e.g. p. 4 n.11), or by adding '(?)' (e.g. p. 26 n.8). At a few places they quote the relevant words from the commentary (e.g. p. 14 n.9).

is by no means a rare occurrence,²⁸ and it may be worth giving a few illustrations, to which attention has not been drawn before, of support being found for different readings in different commentaries.²⁹

1. In the opening section of the PDhS a brief review of the six categories is given, in which the ultimate individuators are thus described: *nityadravyavṛttayo 'ntyā viśeṣāḥ | te khalv atyantavyāvṛttihetuvād viśeṣā eva* (text as in Dvivedin's edition, 13.20–21). For the words *te khalv atyantavyāvṛttihetuvād* Bronkhorst and Ramseier (p. 2, § 8) report two variants in the published edition: *te ca khalv atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetuvād* and *te khalv atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetuvād*.³⁰ The commentaries have the following to say.

Vyomaśiva: *te ca viśeṣā viśeṣayanti vyāvartayanti svāśrayam āśrayāntarād iti | parikṣārtham āha—te cātyantam sarvadā vyāvṛttibuddher eva hetuvād viśeṣā eva | na sāmānyam apīti* (Vyo² vol. 1 24.25–26). This supports *te ca*, and not a following *khalu*, but not very strongly, as this type of evidence is relatively easy to tamper with. The support for *atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetuvāt* is stronger though.

Śrīdhara: *te khalv iti | khaluśabdo niścaye | nityadravyavṛttayo ye viśeṣā te viśeṣā eva niścītā, na tu sāmānyāny api bhavantiṣṭi arthaḥ | atyantam sarvadā vyāvṛtter eva svāśrayasyetarasmād vyavacchedasyaiva hetuvāt kāraṇatvād iti* (NK² 47.5–7, NK¹ 14.3–5). This provides strong support for reading *khalu* in the text and almost as strong support, I should say, for doing so without a preceding *ca*, together with strong support for *atyantavyāvṛttihetuvāt*, with no *°buddhi°*. Interestingly, the *°buddhi°* is universally attested in the manuscripts I have seen; one manuscript I have collated (no. 8880 of the Asiatic Society, Calcutta [= Tanaka's no. 4]) has *°buddher* instead, but I have not yet found one which omits the word altogether.

Udayana: *nanu tathāpi sāmānyāny eva kānicit tathā bhaviṣyanti, guṇā vā, kiṃ padārthāntarakalpanayā, ity ata āha—te ceti | caḥ svarthah | ayam arthaḥ—te punar yady ekaikavṛttayaḥ katham sāmānyarūpāḥ, anekavyakri- vṛttiṣu ca katham atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetavaḥ | guṇā api bhavantaḥ sāmānyavantaḥ syuḥ, tathāpy atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetutvam vydhanyeta |*

- 28 The instances which may be found from the notes in Bronkhorst and Ramseier 1994 are not all that could be gleaned by a careful reading of the commentaries.
- 29 I have deliberately tried to choose examples, both here and elsewhere in this appendix, which are simple and do not affect the philosophical content of the text to too great an extent. This is because I wish to focus attention on the methodological problems at stake and intend to avoid being led away into the discussion of philosophical points. It is for this reason that most examples come from the *dravya* section.
- 30 For our purpose it is unimportant to note which editions have what reading.

ato niḥsāmānyāḥ, tathā ca guṇatvavyāghātaḥ | tasmād³¹ antyavyapadeśād atyantavyāvṛttibuddher eva hetutvād viśeṣā eva viśeṣāḥ, nānyatrāntarbhūtā iti³² (KĀ 17.14–19). This is strong support for *te ca* and *atyantavyāvṛttibuddhihetuvāt*, and the absence of comment on *khalu* looks significant again.

This is not the place to discuss what reading is most likely to be what Praśastapāda wrote;³³ it is enough to have demonstrated that the commentaries do not unanimously support a particular reading.

2. In the section on water, at PDhS 36.5–7 Dvivedin prints *indriyaṃ sarvaprā-ṇināṃ rasavyaṇjakam vijātyanabhibhūtair jalāvayavair ārabdham rasanam*. Here I want to draw attention only to the word *vijātyanabhibhūtair*.³⁴

Vyomaśiva: *atha kasmāt kimcid evāpyaṃ dravyaṃ rūpādiṣu madhye niyameṇa rasavyaṇjakam indriyaṃ cety āha—anyāvayavānabhibhūtair iṣatsampṛktair api jalāvayavair ārabdham rasanam iti rasasyaiva vyaṇjakam iti | anye tu anyāvayavānabhibhūtair asampṛktair śuddhair jalāvayavair ārabdham iti bruvate* (Vyo² vol. 1 82.16–19). This gives us multiple weak support for *anyāvayavānabhibhūtair*, a reading attested in some editions but only very sporadically in the manuscript tradition.³⁵

Śrīdhara: *tathāpi kasmāt tad eva rasavyaṇjakam syāt, nānyad udakadravyam ity āha—vijātyanabhibhūtair iti | vijātibhiḥ pāṛthivāvayavair ye 'nabhibhūtā apratihatasāmarthyā āpyāvayavais tair itaradravyavilakṣaṇam ārabdham* (NK² 113.2–4, NK¹ 38.15–18). There is rather stronger support here for *vijātyanabhibhūtair*.

Udayana: *anyāvayavānabhibhūtair iti | vātādyabhibhave jaḍajihvātvād iti bhāvaḥ*. Weak support for the same reading Vyomaśiva probably had.

Aside from the question of distinguishing between relatively weak and relatively strong support for a given reading, one must in using the commentaries at least be aware of the fact that they themselves are not available in critical editions and present their own textual problems in many places. Despite this, their evidence can

31 *tasmād*: em., *tasyād* Jetly

32 From the conclusion here it appears that Udayana may have read *viśeṣā eva viśeṣāḥ* instead of *viśeṣā eva*, a variant attested in one edition of the PDhS.

33 Such a discussion would also have to take several related passages in the PDhS into account.

34 For a discussion of the wording of the first part of the sentence see p. 331 below.

35 Out of twenty-three manuscripts I examined for this portion of the text a single one (Oriental Institute, Baroda. Acc. No. 8169, a very corrupt manuscript in Jaina Devanāgarī) reads thus. The Malayalam manuscript I have collated (cf. footnote 24 on p. 325 above) reads *anyāvaya-vāsametair*, but is the only source known to me to do so.

be of great value, as Marui and Preisendanz have shown, and may shed light on historical developments in the Vaiśeṣika. Vyomaśiva's commentary, the *Vyomavatī*, is preserved in a manuscript in Mysore which bears a date corresponding to A.D. 1389,³⁶ which is most probably older than any of the manuscripts of the PDhS that Tanaka or I have been able to examine and which should be regarded as being among the most important witnesses to the text of the PDhS, particularly in those places where the commentary gives 'strong' support to a reading. A critical edition of the *Vyomavatī* would be a very valuable thing, and it could be argued that this ought by rights to precede or accompany an attempt to critically edit the PDhS.³⁷

In view of the fact which we have noted, that the different commentaries at places had clearly divergent texts of the PDhS before them, it would be an interesting task to try and determine whether any particular surviving manuscript or group of manuscripts is closely related to the text of one of the commentators. Several of the early editors noticed that the manuscripts of the PDhS that they used did not agree fully with the text of a commentary (cf. Marui 1985, 110–111). As far as I can say, it is Tanaka who has for the first time suggested a specific correspondence, though without as yet arguing in detail for it. Speaking of Ś₁, he says:

The readings of our *śāradā* manuscript are relatively similar to the readings of VizSS [i.e. the Dvivedin edition of the PDhS together with the *Nyāyakandaī*]. And the different readings found in *śāradā* manuscript are attested to with the readings cited in the NK. It seems that the manuscripts of the PDhS may have different recensions in its textual origin. And our manuscript seems to belong to one recension on which NK. [i.e. the *Nyāyakandaī*] is based. (KV. [i.e. the *Kiraṇā-valī*] might be based on the another recension of the PDhS.) (Tanaka 1994, vi)

If correct, this correspondence between Ś₁ and the *Nyāyakandaī* would be very interesting and significant, though the possibility should be born in mind that the

36 See the description of the manuscript in Slaje 1983, 24–26. In this dissertation, unfortunately unpublished (I am indebted to Dr. Slaje for kindly providing me with a copy). Slaje was the first scholar to make use of the manuscript in studying the text of the *Vyomavatī*. He has been followed most notably by Halbfass, who translated a small section from Vyomaśiva's commentary (1992, 246–255). Halbfass remarks that the manuscript 'solves numerous problems and is generally of great help for a better understanding of the *Vyomavatī*' (1992, 247), and gives a list of twenty-one corrections for four pages of text of Gaurinath Shastri's edition, most of them based on the manuscript reading, commenting in a footnote (no. 31 on p. 265) that '[t]his illustrates that there is still need for a critical edition of this important text.'

37 Of course this situation, a type of *cakraka*, is one which one encounters almost at every turn in studying ancient Indian texts, and it may be more realistic to say that the important thing is that the circle should be broken, no matter where.

manuscript has been influenced by Śrīdhara's commentary rather than being an independent descendent of the manuscript Śrīdhara used. But I am not convinced that Tanaka is right in his observation in the first place, for there are numerous passages I have noticed where the manuscript has a reading which, while possible and attested elsewhere, is almost certainly not what Śrīdhara comments on. Three examples:

1. At the equivalent of PDhS 28.10–11 (Tanaka's sentence 76) Ś₁ has *sthāvarās trṇoṣadhigulmalatāvatānavanaspataya iti* (f. 3v12).³⁸ The long compound here is one for which we find a large number of variant readings. The reading in Ś₁ is relatively poorly attested, but is found also in Ś₂ and no. 396 of 1875/76 in the BORI, a Kashmiri Devanāgarī manuscript which is very closely related to Ś₁ throughout. Śrīdhara probably had the reading *trṇauṣadhivrksagulmalatāvatānavanaspataya(h)*, for his commentary reads *trṇam upalādiḥ, auṣadhyayā phalapākāntā godhūmādayāḥ, ye sapuṣpaphalās te vrkṣāḥ kovidāraprabhṛtayaḥ, gulmāḥ sastūpā vaṃśekṣuprabhṛtayaḥ*,³⁹ *latā prasiddhaiva, avatanvantīty*⁴⁰ *avatānā*⁴¹ *viṭapāḥ ketakīḥijapūrādayaḥ, ye vinā puṣpaṃ phalanti te vanaspataya udumbarādayaḥ* (NK² 106.11–107, NK¹ 35.16–19) The reading Śrīdhara seems to have followed is found in a fairly large group of manuscripts, including the oldest dated one, J₁ (cf. footnote 24 on p. 325 above). It is also supported by Vyomaśiva's commentary.
2. PDhS 36.5–6 (Tanaka's 'sentence' 87) reads in Ś₁ *indriyaṃ sarvaprāṇinām rasopalambhakam* (f. 4r3). This is also the reading of quite a number of other manuscripts. The Nyāyakandalī however suggests *rasavyaṇjakam sarvaprāṇinām* instead of *sarvaprāṇinām rasopalambhakam*, though only with (multiple) 'weak' support: *indriyaṃ rasavyaṇjakam sarvaprāṇinām iti | sarvaprāṇinām rasavyaṇjakam yad indriyaṃ tajjalāyavair ārabdham | tathāpi kasmāt tad eva rasavyaṇjakam syāt. . .* NK² 113.1–2, NK¹ 38.14–16.

38 This folio not being reproduced in Tanaka 1987, I rely on the transcriptions in Tanaka's articles of 1987 and 1991.

39 The words *gulmāḥ sastūpā vaṃśekṣuprabhṛtayaḥ* are omitted in Dvivedin's edition of the Nyāyakandalī. This may be an editorial lapse, or it may reflect the manuscripts, and in the latter case it may be a purely scribal variant or this may be a case where the commentary has been tampered with to support another reading. In general Jetly's manuscript material seems to be superior to that used by Dvivedin, so I prefer to accept his reading at present. If the Dvivedin reading should be original, Śrīdhara presumably read *trṇauṣadhivrksalatāvatānavanaspataya(h)*, still disagreeing with what we find in Ś₁.

40 Thus Dvivedin's edition. The *avatanvantīty* in Jetly's text must be a printing error.

41 After this Dvivedin's edition adds *nāma*, which is not found in the three Nyāyakandalī manuscripts used by Jetly.

3. At PDhS 69.10–11 (Tanaka's sentence 181, Bronkhorst and Ramseier's § 77) the large majority of sources that I am aware of read *na śarīrendriyamanasām, ajñatvāt*. A minority however, including both the birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts, adds *caitanyam* before *ajñatvāt*. Bronkhorst and Ramseier (p. 15 n. 1) have correctly observed that the *Kiraṇāvalī* and the *Nyāyakandalī* confirm the *lectio difficilior*⁴² which omits the subject: Śrīdhara writing *na śarīrendriyamanasām iti | uttaravākyaṣṭhitaṁ caitanyam iti padam iha sambadhyate* (NK² 179.10–11, NK¹ 72.6), and Udayana having *na śarīrendriyamanasām | caitanyam agre vakṣyati*⁴³ (KĀ 86.9–10). Vyomaśīva's commentary is the only one which is reasonably consistent with reading *caitanyam* here.

Such cases lead me to believe that Tanaka overstates the relationship between Ś, and the *Nyāyakandalī*. Nonetheless, the idea is good, and it is certainly worth continuing to try and identify a close correspondence between a manuscript and the text followed by a particular commentator.

2.3 Other testimonia

In addition to the evidence provided by commentaries, other testimonia may also be of use in constituting the text, and should at any rate be collected and taken seriously into consideration. When quotations from the PDhS are found in relatively old works, we may have an independent transmission of some passages at least that goes back to a source earlier than the oldest manuscripts that are now available. Such citations may be particularly interesting if they also provide comments on the quoted passage that allow the wording to be checked to some extent at least.

A serious attempt to collect all citations of the PDhS will require extensive reading, and therefore access to a first-rate library of Sanskrit texts. From my own desultory explorations it has become clear that the work is quoted a very large number of times and in literature of surprising diversity. It is natural that many of these quotations are found in philosophical works, of the Vaiśeṣika and of e.g. the Buddhists and the Jains. More surprising is that the PDhS is cited even in works of quite

42 The sentence is printed in italics by Bronkhorst and Ramseier, indicating use of the 'vārtika style.'

43 Jetly reports a variant (from an earlier edition) *caitanyam ity agre bhaviṣyati* for *caitanyam agre vakṣyati*; this looks incidentally like a slightly more explicit and therefore probably secondary reading.

different genres, such as Śaiva theology,⁴⁴ *alaṃkāraśāstra*⁴⁵ and commentaries on classical poetry.⁴⁶

3 The editorial problem

The situation with which a prospective editor of the PDhS is confronted is one which is by no means an exceptional one, but it presents difficulties which have no easy solution. We have, to sum up, a text which undoubtedly goes back to a single author but which has been transmitted over a long period and survives in a large number of manuscripts, the oldest of which are separated from the time of composition by nearly a millennium, and which vary to a large degree. We may be certain that the extant manuscripts, numerous though they are, form but a small fraction of the total number of written records of the work that have existed since its composition. Furthermore, as of the present, even of the extant manuscripts the large majority has not been collated. There are sources (particularly the commentaries) which may allow glimpses of states of the text pre-dating all our manuscripts, but these are incomplete, conflicting and perhaps not always reliable.

In view of the fact that only a small proportion of the manuscripts is available to me, it would be premature to put forth here elaborate theories as to their mutual relationship. Nonetheless, on the basis of the limited amount of information now at my disposal, I predict that the construction of a stemma, i.e. of a hypothesis as to the relationship of the manuscripts with an acceptable degree of plausibility, will prove to be a very difficult task. This is not merely because of the complexity of the taxonomy of so great a number of different textual states, but because I believe that conflation has played large enough a role that it will only be in the case of perhaps a few groups of clearly related manuscripts that the evidence will be consistent enough to allow classical methods of textual analysis to be applied with a degree of success.⁴⁷

44 Kumāradeva (second half of the 11th century) quotes the *prāśastapādīyaṃ vaiśeṣikabhāṣyam* in his *Tātparyadīpikā* on Bhoja's *Tattvaparakāśa*; see Vrajavallabha Dvivedī (ed.), *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*, Varanasi 1988 (Yogatantra-granthamālā vol. 12), 91.16–17. Intriguingly, Abhinavagupta refers in his *Parātriṃśikāvivarṇa* (57.4–5) to a work of his, now lost, which, from its title, *Padārthapraveśanīyāṭkā*, could conceivably be a commentary on the PDhS.

45 Bhoja's *Śṛṅgārāprakāśa*, the largest classical *alaṃkāraśāstra* textbook, quotes from the PDhS, referring to *Prāśastapāda* by name, and his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (again the *alaṃkāraśāstra* work, not the grammatical one of the same name) also quotes from the PDhS. See Raghavan 1963, 757 for a collection of the relevant passages.

46 Cāṇḍūpaṇḍita's commentary on the *Naiṣadhacarita*, written in A.D. 1297 (cf. Handiqui 1965, xviii), quotes from the PDhS in explaining verse 19.52 of the poem. See the extract given by Handiqui (1965, 486); regrettably this important commentary remains unpublished save for the fragments quoted in Handiqui's notes to his translation of the *Naiṣadhacarita*.

47 The method developed by Dearing (1983 [first published 1959]) to determine the relationship of

There are several reasons to believe the level of contamination to be high. The situation appears to be very comparable to that which Srinivasan discovered and described with regard to Vācaspati Miśra's *Tattvakaumudī*. The number of manuscripts of that text is comparable with that of the PDhS, though it is rather larger, and like the PDhS it is a work that has been studied intensively, commented on, and copied over the length and breadth of India. Srinivasan came to the conclusion, which seems convincing enough on the basis of the evidence given, that genetic relationships between his manuscripts could not be established.⁴⁸ He even raises the question whether the *Tattvakaumudī* ever was transmitted in purely vertical lines of descent.

Furthermore, a number of the manuscripts of the PDhS show clear signs of the process of contamination; i.e., like many of Srinivasan's manuscripts, they contain corrections that strongly suggest that more than one exemplar was used in producing the state of the text that ultimately resulted. We have seen examples of this in the BORI birch-bark manuscript in Śāradā script (cf. p. 318 above), which though undated is probably among the oldest manuscripts we have.⁴⁹ That was a case of 'correctional conflation,' to use the term coined by Greg (1927, 56), and there are several others known to me. There is also at least one manuscript which is patently an instance of 'editorial conflation,'⁵⁰ with variant readings given in marginal notes by the original scribe, and there may well be others which do not obviously betray

textual states when dealing with conflation is not only very impractical if the number of sources is large but is also methodologically somewhat dubious, although it is possible that further refinement may render it applicable in some cases at least. Cf. in particular the review of Dearing's 1974 book (a revised version of Dearing 1983 [first published 1959] which is not available to me at present) by Weitzman (1977); Dearing's response (1979) is not convincing in all respects: note his remark 'I believe that chance is likely to be a negligible cause of agreement between texts *as long as it is reasonably clear that the texts were intended to be as much like their exemplars as possible*' (p. 357, my emphasis). This stipulation is one which is only fulfilled in very exceptional cases, in my opinion. For another convincing criticism of a crucial part of Dearing's method see Salemans 1990, especially p. 456–458.

- 48 'In unserem Material ist aber Kontamination... in dem Maße gegeben, daß in ihm keine Überlieferungslinien zu erkennen sein. D.h. es kommt unter unseren Handschriften und Drucken nicht zur Bildung fester genetischer Gruppen, Gruppen also, denen jeweils eine an der Gesamtmenge des Sekundären gemessen große Anzahl von solchen Unursprünglichkeiten gemeinsam wäre, die höchst wahrscheinlich nur einmal aufgekommen sind' Srinivasan 1967, 6.
- 49 Tanaka, writing of the two birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts, thinks that '[a]lthough it is impossible to tell exactly when these manuscripts were made, it is sure that they are the oldest of the manuscripts that I have collected' (1991, 1). I think it may be true that they are the oldest ones, but his confidence is too great: it is very difficult to date manuscripts in Śāradā script, and I have seen birch-bark Śāradā manuscripts of other texts bearing dates in the seventeenth century which are very similar to the two PDhS ones.
- 50 A manuscript on paper and in Śāradā script in the manuscript collection of the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain, no. 4631. The manuscript has apparently not been collected by Tanaka.

the fact that their text has been composed in a similar way.

There is every reason to suppose that the process of conflation has been going on for a very long time indeed. It may not necessarily have taken place on an extremely large scale; it is quite possible that more than fifty percent, say, of the manuscripts of the PDhS were copied from a single source and never compared and collated against another, but I have no doubt that the level is significant enough to render it very difficult to establish genetic relationships between the manuscripts.⁵¹ Nor is it only these reflections that have caused me to be thus convinced; various attempts on my part to work out a 'stemma' of the manuscripts available to me have confirmed this to my own satisfaction at least.

Here it might perhaps be asked if some of the difficulties could not be avoided by taking into consideration only the manuscripts which contain the entire text of the PDhS, thus reducing the number of sources to be considered by well over fifty percent (cf. p. 324 above). If it is true that in the last five centuries or so interest in the complete text diminished appreciably, one might expect that the complete manuscripts would in general be older, more reliable and perhaps less conflated—aside from the fact that the reduction in number would make the purely mathematical side of the analysis less complex.

This suggestion seems to me one which has some practical advantages to recommend it. However it does not by any means nullify the problem of contamination. It will be remembered that it was in a manuscript of the complete text, and an old one at that, that we saw signs of correctional conflation. It is also doubtful whether we have any manuscripts that really date from the period before transmission of the *dravya* section alone became widespread. If we do not, there is an additional factor that makes conflation more likely: anyone who did want to have a complete text of the PDhS, but had a manuscript of the *dravya* section alone, would very probably try to find a complete manuscript and if he produced a new copy would be prone to conflate the two. That this happened indeed is strongly suggested by, again, the BORI Śāradā manuscript when it is compared with Ś₁, for Tanaka remarks, without calling attention to or perhaps even realizing the implications, that 'in this *Dravya-prakarāṇa* there are few differences between the two manuscripts, and it can be said that they are complements of each other. But we can detect a great many variants in the *Guṇa-prakarāṇa* and elsewhere' (Tanaka 1991, 2).⁵²

51 Cf. e.g. West's remark 'If contamination is present in more than a slight degree, it will be found that no stemmatic hypothesis is satisfactory' (1973, 36).

52 This should also warn us that classification of the manuscripts into groups by script is a dangerous thing. It is doubtful whether we should speak of 'the textual tradition of the PDS in śāradā' (Tanaka 1991, 1), as if the Śāradā manuscripts formed a clearly defined group or recension. In fact they do not. In addition to the two Śāradā manuscripts transcribed by Tanaka I have looked at a Śāradā manuscript in Ujjain (cf. footnote 50 above) and a birch-bark Śāradā manuscript of

To turn now from these perhaps discouraging reflections, we should again recall that there is nothing out of the ordinary in these problems; editors of for instance medieval European texts have been trying to cope with similar and greater difficulties for more than a century. It should be possible to learn from the experience of such scholars at least what lines of approach come into consideration.⁵³ There are various possible courses for a would-be editor of our text, each with different merits and disadvantages.

First one could mention the possibility of a 'stemmatic' attempt at a critical edition, one which attempts to determine the relationship between the manuscripts and on that basis evaluate the strength of individual readings. After what has just been said it may be surprising that this option is mentioned here, but it is one which I do not think should be ruled out yet. Even in the case of seriously contaminated traditions the problem of stemmatic analysis may not be as hopeless as it is usually thought to be. The method proposed by Dearing admittedly has serious drawbacks (cf. footnote 47 on p. 334 above), but refinements are possible, and several scholars,

the *dravya* section alone in the British Museum (not mentioned by Tanaka), and am convinced that there is no unified 'Śāradā recension.' The only case I see of manuscripts in a particular script seeming to be close enough that it might be possible to group them together is that of the Bengali manuscripts I have examined. However, as I have only collated five, it is quite likely that several of the other manuscripts in Bengali script will not confirm this picture. Compare also the findings of Srinivasan, who found his Grantha, Malayalam, Oriya, Śāradā and Bengali manuscripts to be as contaminated as the Devanāgarī ones (1967, 5). For the text-criticism of the *Mahābhārata* too the classification of manuscripts into recensions chiefly according to script by the editors of the critical edition is highly problematic: cf. Grünendahl 1993, which also makes general (critical) observations on what Grünendahl calls the 'Schriftartprämissen.'

- 53 Here it may be permissible to observe that standards of awareness of text-critical problems and methodology among editors of Sanskrit texts seem to be almost distressingly low. If editors refer at all to theoretical studies of these problems, it is often merely to Maas' famous essay on 'Textkritik,' an admittedly important work but one which represents only one particular school of thought, which is no longer dominant among textual editing in most fields. Tanselle has made some cogent remarks which apply with full force to nearly all editors of classical Indian texts.

By not familiarizing themselves with the textual criticism of classical, biblical, and medieval literature, textual scholars of more recent literature are cutting themselves off from a voluminous body of theoretical discussion and the product of many generations of experience. And by not keeping up with developments in the editing of post-medieval writings, students of earlier works are depriving themselves of the knowledge of significant advances in editorial thinking. (Tanselle 1990, 275)

Srinivasan's work is one of the rare exceptions to this rather blinkered tendency, though as far as I can see he does not make any reference to Dearing's work, which would have been of some relevance to the problems he deals with. Hisashi Matsumura, in a brief article 'On Editing Indian Codices Multi,' in *Aligarh Journal of Oriental Studies* 3 (1986), 93–100, also pleads for awareness by Indologists and Buddhologists of 'ideas and methods in researching in related disciplines' (p. 100), referring particularly to classical, medieval and Biblical studies, though his citations of work by medievalists are somewhat one-sided and outdated.

driven by necessity or interest, have in the last few years attacked the problem with admirable vigour.⁵⁴ It may be worth trying to apply the results of their experience to the transmission of the PDhS and, to borrow Shackleton Bailey's phrase (1976, 27), turn the mob of manuscripts into a family. Such an attempt can best wait, however, till all the manuscripts that can possibly be found have been collated; as even Dearing admits, in a conflated tradition the absence or presence of witnesses can have important consequences on the picture of the relationships.⁵⁵

Another approach would be to give up the endeavour to recover exactly what Praśastapāda wrote. One could instead try to reconstruct the text as known to a particular commentator, a version which is almost certainly not identical in all respects to the original but of which we know that it had currency and, at least through the commentary, importance at a particular time. For this, since the commentaries do not allow us to determine their readings at all places, it would be necessary to identify manuscripts which seem to be very close to the recension followed by one of

- 54 Using a mainly theoretical approach, with simulated data, Flight claims to 'have shown that complicated—"open"—traditions are not impossible to penetrate by means of stemmatic analysis. In theory, under certain conditions, we can still succeed in disentangling the relationships among the surviving manuscripts' (1992, 49). He is well aware that it remains to be seen whether things will work this way in practice: 'To reach this result, we have worked with imaginary data in which there is guaranteed to be a perfect match between the patterns of agreement permitted by the stemma and the patterns of distribution exemplified by the variants. It goes without saying that in real traditions we do not expect this guarantee to hold. In other words, we expect the distribution of some variants not to accord with any of the patterns allowed by the original stemma. These variants are the noise in the data. The question we are left with is this: how and how far can we filter out such noise, by taking advantage of any redundancy in the original message? Until we can answer this question, the integration of theory and practice will not have been achieved' (op. cit. loc. cit.). What Flight refers to as 'noise' is of course essentially the same as the phenomenon of accidental convergence; if anything a more serious threat to the legitimacy of the stemmatic approach than conflation is.

Another interesting contribution, the value of which I have not yet been able to fully assess, is made by Mulken, in her 1993 dissertation on *The manuscript tradition of the Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes*, subtitled *A stemmatological and dialectological approach*, in which she claims to have been successful in uncovering the complex network of relationships between the manuscripts of this notoriously conflated tradition, using methods developed by Dees.

- 55 'The recovery or creation of additional manuscripts will only fill in or extend a bibliographic scheme: however, if conflation is present, the recovery or creation of additional states may require the alteration of a textual scheme. Since textual continuity results from the regular shift of likenesses and differences from one state to the next, conflicting chains of likeness and difference brought about by conflation force the choice of the simplest of several possibilities. Then the appearance of additional states may shift the balance in favor of a possibility previously rejected. This is a peculiarity of conceptual schemes of all kinds and does not affect their validity' (Dearing 1983, 6–7). While this fact may not affect the validity of the method, as Dearing says, it is an important limitation which in practice must be recognized and reckoned with by basing the reconstruction on all available sources.

the commentators, something which has not yet been successfully done (cf. p. 330ff. above). It would also be advisable to do this together with a critical edition of the relevant commentary itself.⁵⁶

Finally, it would be possible to choose for a procedure in which the manuscript evidence would be collected and reported as thoroughly as possible, but in which stemmatic considerations would play no role; in other words, acceptance of a particular reading would be in principle independent of the number and identity of the manuscripts that bear witness to it. Such a method is essentially what Srinivasan followed in a comparable situation; see his description and illustration of the principles he has tried to follow on pp. 29–53. The chief among these, which underlies almost all the others, is the rule expressed in these words: 'Bei uneinheitlicher Überlieferung wurde diejenige Lesung als primär bewertet, auf die sich genetisch alle zurückführen lassen' (1967, 29). This general idea, of which the principle *lectio difficilior potior* may be said to be a special case, is a valid and powerful one, which indeed does at many places allow one to arrive at a fairly convincing solution. Many variants remain, however, between which it does not allow a definite decision.⁵⁷ As we have to do, however, with a text that may be attributed in its original form to an individual author, it is possible that a deep study of the work and its myriad transmitted states will enable an editor to familiarize himself so thoroughly with the *usus auctori* as well as the *usus scribendi* that a justifiable choice can be made even in such difficult cases.⁵⁸ It is more or less this tactic that I tried in preparing a preliminary edition of a portion of the text (cf. p. 322 above).

Whichever approach an editor chooses for, it is certain that his reconstruction of the PDhS can never be more than a single hypothesis. This does not render the attempt fruitless, though, and if carried out carefully by a scholar familiar with the material such a reconstruction may be of use to others and of value for the study of Indian philosophy and its historical development. It is perhaps conceivable that

- 56 In view of the character of our text and its transmission another possibility, to use some form of the 'best-text' method popular among many medievalists, does not come into serious consideration, in my view. A kind of modified best-text method has been proposed for the edition of the *Skandapurāṇa* (cf. Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson 1994), but there we have a manuscript that is separated from the original by much less time, perhaps two centuries or so, and which is clearly superior to the other witnesses. Moreover the text itself is one which was probably always much more fluid than the PDhS.
- 57 'In den vorausgehenden Erörterungen war die Unterscheidung primär:sekundär möglich, weil durchweg intentionale oder mechanische zur Variantenbildung führende Momente erkennbar waren. Nicht selten lassen sich aber keine solchen Momente erkennen: dann ist der konstituierte Text ungesichert' (Srinivasan 1967, 44).
- 58 It is perhaps Kane who has done most to develop and illustrate this type of 'deep editing,' especially through his famous edition, together with Donaldson, of the B-text of *Piers Plowman* (London 1975).

the construction of stemmas may one day become a labour which can be carried out largely mechanically, by rule, i.e. by computer. The same is certainly not true of the establishing of a critical text; that will always remain an activity requiring human decision, and the value of the result will depend in large measure on the clarity and lack of prejudice of the editor's judgment.

APPENDIX 4

REFERENCES IN BHATTA VĀDĪNDRA'S WRITINGS

A list of authors and works referred to by Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra was given by Thakur, on the last two pages of his 1960 article on our author. The motivation for compiling such a list afresh is two-fold. Firstly, Thakur left out or overlooked a large number of references,¹ while others which he gives contain errors. Secondly, the long version of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra's VS commentary, the *Tarkasāgara*, can now be referred to in a form which should be fairly easily available—the edition by Thakur—rather than, as Thakur in 1960 did, by references to the folio numbers in the Mithila Institute transcripts.²

The present list too may well suffer from omissions and errors, aside from inaccuracies which are unavoidable in view of the often poor quality of the edited texts. The edition of the commentary on the *guṇa* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* (GKṬ) and the edition of the *Tarkasāgara* (TS) both lack any indices. Though both frequently print personal names and titles of works in bold-face, they are by no means consistent in doing so.

In compiling this list I have had to make various decisions which were far from clear-cut—particularly in drawing the line of what to include and what to leave out. In brief, I have made the following choices, sometimes arbitrarily perhaps.³ The main principle was that the list should make it possible to find all cases where Bhaṭṭa Vāḍīndra refers by name to an author, a school or sub-school of thought, or to a text. In this I include—as Thakur evidently did not—cases of self-reference and

1 If I have not miscounted, Thakur gives a total of 226 references under 80 entries while the list below contains 1185 references under 153 entries. This discrepancy is partly due, however, to different policies on what to incorporate in such a list; cf. below.

2 A further, more trivial, difference between the list given here and Thakur's, is that the latter is ordered according to the Roman alphabet, whereas this one follows the normal order for Sanskrit names and words.

3 Undoubtably everyone who has attempted to make such an index or list must have been confronted with the same or similar decisions, but in the cases I am familiar with at least, nothing is explicitly said about this matter, and in using such tools one is forced to discover experimentally what principles were followed.

those where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions a patron by name. Two items only which Thakur chooses to list have I left out; these are *īśvara*⁴ (other designations for God have also not been included), and *sugata*; the latter because I was unable to find the word, which according to Thakur occurs once in the Mithila transcripts of the *Tarkasāgara*, in the edition.

But this by no means covers all of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's references. To widen the net, I have also listed the places where he alludes to authors or works by an epithet, thus including also entries such as *kevalānvayiprāmāṇyavādin* or *yogaśāstra*. As the last example illustrates, not only references to individual works are included but in addition such as may rather be to a genre or class of texts; thus *itihāsa* and *buddhāgama* are also found in the list.

The concept of a reference to a text has been stretched a little to include occurrences of the word *sūtra* (most usually referring to part of the VS) and references to *adhyāyas* and *āhnikas* of the VS; thus an entry will also be found for e.g. *navamādhyāya*.⁵ Somewhat inconsistently, no doubt, I have not also indexed occurrences of the word *prakaraṇa*, with which Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra also occasionally refers to a particular section of the VS.

Finally, I have also decided to list cases where thinkers are referred to merely by certain pronouns, considering it unsatisfactory not to enable users also to find the places where Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra mentions, for instance, an opposing view or interpretation which is introduced merely with *anye tu* or *kecit*. Aside from these two,⁶ the pronouns taken up in the list are *anya*, *apara*, *asmāt*,⁷ *para* and *bhavat*. It should be noted that occurrences of these are only listed when they are not accompanied by a further designation; thus in such a case as *ity apare sampradāyavidah* (DKT 655.3–4) an entry is made only under *sampradāyavid*. I have drawn the line at also indexing the relative and correlative (demonstrative) pronouns, even though in some cases a group of thinkers may be only referred to with these, as in constructions such as *ye tu vyañjakatvānupapattāv iti hetuviśeṣaṇam āhuḥ, teṣāṃ vyarthaviśeṣa-*

- 4 Which occurs rather more frequently than the two text-references given by Thakur suggest; I have noted the word at more than a hundred places in our corpus.
- 5 In the case of entries of the last type, references to *adhyāyas* of the VS, all references are given under the compound form, for instance *navamādhyāya*, even if the text actually has, say, *navame 'dhyāye* or simply *navame*.
- 6 It has of course been necessary to distinguish between usages, especially of *kaścit* and inflected forms thereof. Only in cases where one may presume that proponents of some particular view are meant has the occurrence been noted.
- 7 The cases of usage of the first person pronoun have been arranged under this entry because almost all are formed from the plural base. The few exceptions (occurrences of e.g. *mayā*) are indicated as such. Note that usages such as *asmādādipratyaṅga* have not been included here; only when the first person is used to distinguish the view of one party of thinkers from another has it been indexed.

naivam (GKṬ 48.17–19). One could of course try to find and include all of these, but one would still have a problem with cases where a particular standpoint is referred to merely by the use of a finite verb-form such as *manyase* or *āhuḥ*. In short, I feel this to belong rather to a (complete or selected) word-index, a further tool which would certainly be of immense value but the compilation of which would require a vast investment of time and effort.⁸

A companion index to this one, in which the quotations from other works which we find in Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's corpus are collected and identified (as far as possible), would be another very useful thing to have. This too must wait for the time being, however, as particularly with the identification of citations I have not yet made sufficient progress for it to be worth attempting to present such an index here.

Some technical notes on the presentation. The corpus indexed includes *prāṭikas*, quotations from other authors' writings and the colophons of the *Tarkasāgara*; in all cases where a word occurs as part of one of these this is indicated between square brackets. The *Tarkasāgara* colophons have been included because I believe that they are authorial.⁹ In the case of references in the two versions of the VS commentary cross-references are added in square brackets if there are clear parallels; for those portions of the abridged version (V) which are re-edited above the corresponding page and line number in the new edition are similarly added.

Occurrences of the same name with and without a prefix such as Śrī or Bhaṭṭa or a suffix such as *ācārya* are placed under a single entry (a cross-reference being however added in the case of prefixes). The choice of the form under which the references are collected has been usually dictated by the manner in which the person in question is most usually referred to, in both classical works and modern secondary literature. Thus preference has been given to Vallabhācārya rather than Śrīvallabhācārya but to Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra rather than Vādīndra.

In the hope of increasing the usefulness of the index I have adopted some further measures. When words occur as part of a compound the preceding or following word, or in some cases more than that,¹⁰ is usually given, so that it may be possible to identify particularly interesting references with greater ease.¹¹ Finally, a fair

8 And of course the value of a word-index is to a great degree dependent on the quality of the editions available to prepare it from, which in the case of the works of our author is not particularly high.

9 See on this point the Introduction above, p. 12. The exception to this is the last colophon, that of the second *āhnika* of the second *adhyāya* (TS 253.10–12), for there an editorial footnote tells us that the manuscript breaks off shortly before the end of the *āhnika*, so it may be concluded that this colophon has been supplied by the editor.

10 It seemed impractical and counter-productive to give the complete compound in many cases, especially as Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's compounds can be extremely long indeed.

11 To save a little space, *prabhṛti* as the posterior member of a compound has been replaced by the

number of cross-references to closely related entries are given. Both these measures have however not been applied as rigidly as some might perhaps wish.

synonymous (and more frequent) *adi*; it was felt that nothing important was lost hereby.

aṅga TS 2.14 (sa° °veda) [≈ V 1.16], 15.30 (sa° °veda) [quote]; V 1.16 (sa° °veda) [≈ TS 2.14].

anya DKṬ 633.19 (pl.), 676.16 (pl.); GKṬ 71.12 (pl.), TS 6.22 (pl.), 6.32 (pl.), 77.3 (pl.), 108.5 (pl.) 108.20 (pl.), 120.25 (pl.), 152.6, 152.10, 188.17 (pl.), 249.12 (pl.) [≈ V 31.4]; V 31.4 (pl.) [≈ TS 249.12].

apara DKṬ 630.7.

aṣṭamādhyāya V 75.13.

asmat MVV 74.11 (pl.), 87.7 (pl.), 107.4 (pl.), 111.10 (pl.), 113.20 (pl.); DKṬ 622.26 (°vyākhyāna), 623.16 (pl.), 635.16 (°mata), 702.1 (sg.); GKṬ 46.20 (pl.), 46.25 (pl.), 64.17 (pl.), 76.12 (pl.), 87.4–5 (°mata); TS 1.6 (sg.), 5.3 (°mata), 6.5 (pl.), 9.27 (pl.), 20.5 (°mata), 20.27 (°mata), 20.31 (pl.), 44.34 (pl.), 45.2 (pl.), 53.9 (pl.), 61.6–7 (pl.), 72.31 (pl.), 96.28 (°mata), 128.29 (pl.), 129.31 (pl.) 135.14 (pl.), 137.4 (pl.), 138.5 (°mata), 138.29 (°mata), 142.20 (°mata), 142.26 (°mata), 143.9 (pl.), 146.12 (pl.), 146.21, 151.2 (pl.), 151.5 (pl.), 153.7 (pl.), 157.7 (°mata), 170.19 (°mata), 179.21 (°mata), 230.23 (°uktapramāṇa), 230.24 (pl.); V 5.1 (pl.).

āgama DKṬ 620.22 (°mūlatva) [pratika], 620.25 (°mūlatva), 626.11; GKṬ 2.22, 3.1 (°mātra), 4.3 (°mātra) [pratika], 21.13, 21.17 (anāditva° °bādhā); TS 15.25, 48.7, 219.16 [≈ V

21.13], 219.20; V 1.9 (°mūlatva), 21.13 [≈ TS 219.16], 40.22.

ācārya DKṬ 618.7 (= Udayana), 627.1 (pl.) [pratika],¹² 627.26 (°abhipreta), 630.29, 633.26, 637.12, 645.20 (pl.) [pratika], 647.4 (pl.), 677.12; GKṬ 31.3 (= Udayana?), TS 9.26, 81.29 (pl.), 188.19 (pl.), 207.20 (pl.) [≈ V 19.5],¹³ 226.6 (pl.), 249.19 (= Kaṇāda) [≈ V 31.10]; V 19.5 (pl.) [≈ TS 207.20], 31.10 (= Kaṇāda) [≈ TS 249.19]; see also *nyāyācārya*, *pūrvācārya* and *prācīnācārya*.

āmṇāya DKṬ 629.3 [quote]; TS 12.33 [quote], 13.4, 13.5, 13.14, 13.21 [quote], 15.26 (°prāmāṇya) [quote], 15.28 [2x], 31.27 [quote], 49.24 [quote], 56.27 [quote], 57.13.

Ātreya TS 15.11 (°mata), 41.30 (pl.),¹⁴ 66.24 (pl.) [≈ V 3.17], 87.23, 92.22–23 (pl.), 92.31 (pl.), 107.25 (pl.), 121.22, 123.17 (°vyākhyāna), 125.15 (pl.), 128.22,¹⁵ 140.11 (pl.), 149.29 (pl.), 175.24 (pl.) [≈ V 15.8], 186.22, 187.4 (pl.), 205.25 (pl.), 215.29, 217.16 (°ādī), 217.17 (°ādī), 239.29 (°ādī), 242.23 (°ādī); V 3.17 (pl.) [≈ TS 66.24], 15.8 (pl.) [≈ TS 175.24], 65.16 (°ādī) [= p. 66.6 above].

itihāsa TS 13.2 (°ādī) [≈ V 2.17]; V 2.17 (°ādī) [≈ T 13.2].

Udayana MVV 83.8 (°ādī); DKṬ 618.5; TS 9.33, 10.2, 45.1 (°ādī), 45.2 (°ādī), 60.23 (°ādī) [≈ V 2.26], 71.8, 98.10 (°ādī), 98.33 (°ādī), 108.30

12 Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra remarks *ācāryā iiii sopahāsam*.

13 The word has been restored here by Thakur.

14 Emend *ātreyačāryas tu* to *ātreyačāryās tu* to agree with the plural verb (*manyante*): quoted correctly in Thakur 1969, 490 n. 5.

15 The name has been partly restored by Thakur at this place.

- (°ādi) [≈ V 8.17], 137.25 (°ādi), 138.7 (°ādimata), 215.30 (°ādi); V 2.26 (°ādi) [≈ TS 60.23], 8.17 [≈ TS 108.30]; see also *ācārya* and *siddhāntin*.
- upanīṣat* TS 57.13 (*sarva*° pl.).
- Rgveda* TS 242.4 (°śruti).
- Kaṇāda* DKṬ 621.19; GKṬ 14.11 (°ādi-*vrddha*), 60.2 (°ādi), TS 2.8, 2.9, 63.5, 63.6, 219.16 (°ādi) [≈ V 21.12], 219.16–17 (°sākṣātkāra) [≈ V 21.13]; V 21.12 (°ādi) [≈ TS 219.16], 21.13 (°sākṣātkāra) [≈ TS 219.16–17]; see also *ācārya*, *bhagavān*, *vaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetr*, *sūtrakāra* and *sūtrakṛt*.
- Kaṇādasūtravārttika* TS 158.27 [colophon]; see also *Tarkasāgara* and *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika*.
- kaścit* MVV 6.26, DKṬ 621.21 (pl.), 622.23, 623.4, 623.11 (pl.), 633.21, 636.7, 644.2, 653.12 [*pratīka*], 657.12 (pl.), 662.27 (pl.); GKṬ 43.6 (pl.), 56.6 (pl.) [*pratīka*], 60.25 (pl.), 68.3, 96.25, 100.19 (pl.); TS 66.31 (pl.), 67.2, 67.6 (pl.) [≈ V 3.23], 96.32 (pl.), 107.3 (pl.), 115.11 (pl.), 115.18 (pl.), 207.28 (pl.) [≈ V 19.9], 245.19 (pl.); V 3.23 (pl.) [≈ TS 67.6], 19.9 (pl.) [≈ TS 207.28].
- Kāṇādasūtra* TS 1.6; see also *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* and *sūtra*.
- Kādambarī* DKṬ 620.20 (°ādi); TS 1.19 (°ādi).
- Kālidāsa* TS 48.19 (°ādi), 48.26 (°ādi), V 58.7 [= p. 57.7 above].¹⁶
- Kiraṇāvalī* DKṬ 618.6.
- Kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇaka* See *Haraprasādānāma Kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇaka*.
- Kumārasambhava* DKṬ 618.19 (°ādi).
- Kulārkaṇḍita* MVV 17.11 (pl.).
- Kusumāñjali* DKṬ 663.14; GKṬ 92.24.
- Kṛṣṇa* TS 56.19 [colophon].
- kecit* See *kaścit*.
- kevalānvayiprāmāṇyavādin* MVV 111.10
- kṣaṇabhaṅgavādin* TS 153.33.
- kṣapaṇaka* V 70.22 (°ādi) [= p. 72.5 above].
- Khaṇḍana* DKṬ 622.21, 635.17.
- guru* MVV 136.8 (pl.) [= Prabhākara-*cārya* (pl.) according to Bhuvanasundara-sūri]; V 3.27 (°*matanirasana*rtham) [≈ TS 67.17 (Prābhākara!)]]; see also Prabhākara and Prābhākara.
- caturthādhyāya* V 66.19 [2x] [= p. 67.16 above].
- Janaka* DKṬ 703.26 (°ādi).
- Jina* TS 41.5 (°vākya).
- jaināgama* TS 41.11.
- Jaimini* DKṬ 622.11; TS 210.14, 210.20, V 59.3 (°ādi).
- ṭikākāra* MVV 98.15 (°ādi).
- Tarkasāgara* TS 57.20 (°nāman) [colophon]; see also *Kaṇādasūtravārttika* and *Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika*.

16 The °ādi in Thakur's edition is absent in the manuscript and has not been accepted in the text I give; cf. footnote 5 on p. 79 above.

trītyādhyāya V 75.8.

trisūtrī TS 13.14, 14.10, 56.21 (*vyākhyā)
[colophon].

dviṭīyādhyāya TS 119.13 (*ādī), 191.15;
V 65.7 [=p. 64.7 above], 65.11
[=p. 64.14 above].

dviṭīyāhnika TS 89.15, 158.28 [colophon],
159.25.

Dharmakīrti TS 226.9.

dharmaśāstra TS 15.30 [quote].

navamādhyāya DKṬ 623.10; TS 60.1
(*vyatirikta), 70.29.

navīna DKṬ 661.9 (pl.), 684.21 (pl.), 689.4
(pl.); GKṬ 31.4 (pl.).

navīnatārkika GKṬ 62.22 (*mata); TS
112.14 (pl.), 113.9.

naiyāyika TS 237.1 (*ādī).

naiyāyikaikadeśin TS 38.6.

Nyāya DKṬ 618.22 (*śāstra); TS 15.30
[quote], 38.6 (*mata).

Nyāyakusumāñjali See *Kusumāñjali*.

Nyāyabhūṣaṇa TS 129.14 (*ādī [≈ V
11.10 (*nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra*)]); see also
nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra, *bhūṣaṇa* and
bhūṣaṇakāra.

nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra GKṬ 4.14; V 11.10
(*ādī) [≈ TS 129.14 (*Nyāyabhūṣa-
ṇa*)]]; see also *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, *Bhūṣa-
ṇa* and *bhūṣaṇakāra*.

nyāyavīt DKṬ 618.6 (pl.), 624.21 (pl.).

Nyāyavaiśeṣika TS 27.13 (pl.).

nyāyācārya V 48.4 (pl.).

para DKṬ 626.29 (*mata), 627.1 (*mata),
627.2 (*mata), 630.28, 630.29 (pl.),
632.11, 639.18 (pl.), 651.6 (*ma-
ta), 653.11 (*mata), 679.12, 693.8,
696.14 (pl.), 701.16, 701.18, 701.20,
704.13 (pl.); GKṬ 41.3 (pl.), 56.6
(*mata), 71.24 (*mata), 87.19 (*ma-
ta), 89.6 (*abhimata), 90.2 (*abhyu-
pagata) [pratika], 90.2 (*abhyupaga-
ma), 90.15 (*abhyupagama), 90.18
(*abhyupagata), 90.20 (*abhyupa-
gata), 90.23 (*abhyupagata), 90.24
(*mata), 96.10 (pl.) [pratika], 96.12
(pl.); TS 222.16 [≈ V 22.6], 249.19
(*pakṣasādhana) [≈ V 31.10]; V
22.6 (*mata) [≈ TS 222.16], 31.10
(*pakṣasādhana) [≈ TS 249.19].

Pāṇini GKṬ 7.22 (*ādī), 7.25, 8.1 (*ādī);
TS 8.16 (*smaraṇa), 18.11 (*smṛti),
18.16 (*smṛti), 18.18, 62.12 (*sma-
raṇa), 141.1 (*ādī); see also *vaiyāka-
raṇa*.

purāṇa GKṬ 21.13 (*ādī); TS 13.2 (*ādī)
[≈ V 2.17], 15.30 [quote], 41.19 (*ā-
dī), 41.22 (*ādī), 134.32 [quote]; V
2.17 [≈ TS 13.2].¹⁷

pūrvavaiśeṣikācārya TS 170.18.

pūrvācārya MVV 87.7 (pl.), 109.11 (pl.),
109.15 (pl.), 109.16 (pl.); GKṬ 9.11;
TS 188.15.

prathamādhyāya TS 119.16 [colophon],
190.16 [colophon], 191.3, 191.7; V
64.4 [=p. 64.4 above].

prathamāhnika TS 119.17 [colophon],
159.25; V 80.3.

17 For *śrutismṛtīhāsādeḥ* as in Thakur's edition read *śrutismṛtīhāsapurāṇādeḥ* with the manu-
script and in agreement with TS 13.2; cf. Isaacson 1995. 772.

- Prabhākara** GKṬ 97.5, 97.12-13; TS 25.19 (°mata), 30.5 (°mata), 200.24; see also *guru* and *prābhākara*.
- Praśasta** TS 128.22; see also *Praśastapāda*, *praśastapādabhāṣyakāra*, *bhāṣyakāra* and *bhāṣyakṛt*.
- Praśastapāda** TS 7.30 (pl.), 81.6 (pl.), 82.17 (pl.), 169.18 (°vacana), 215.29; V 65.16 [=p. 66.6 above]; see also *Praśasta*, *praśastapādabhāṣyakāra* and *bhāṣyakāra*.
- praśastapādabhāṣyakāra* TS 71.7 (pl.); see also *Praśasta*, *Praśastapāda*, *bhāṣyakāra* and *bhāṣyakṛt*.
- praśastapādaśiṣya* TS 86.15 (pl.).
- prācīnācārya* TS 137.2-3 (pl.).
- Prācīnavaiśeṣikamahāśūtra* TS 8.21.
- prāñc* DKṬ 640.30 (pl.),¹⁸ 661.9 (pl.), 684.21 (pl.), 689.4 (pl.).
- Prābhākara** GKṬ 97.12-13; TS 4.20 (°pakṣa), 6.6 (pl.), 7.9 (pl.), 7.20-21, 7.27-28 (°mata), 24.10, 24.24 (pl.), 30.11 (pl.), 67.17 (pl.) [≈ V 3.27 (*guru*!)], 129.14 (°ādi) [≈ V 11.10], 168.29, 169.17 (pl.), 169.21, 169.23, 169.26, 171.4-5, 177.5, 177.20, 179.9, 212.11 (°mata), 212.13 (°mata), 212.14 (°mata), 222.3 (°mata); V 11.10 (°ādi) [≈ TS 129.14]; see also *guru* and *Prabhākara*.
- Buddha** TS 40.26 (°vākya), 40.29 (°vākya), 41.6 (°jñāna); see also *buddhāgama*, *bauddha* and *saugata*.
- buddhāgama* TS 40.28; see also *Buddha*, *bauddha* and *saugata*.
- bauddha* DKṬ 618.2 (°ādi), 618.4 (°ādi), 664.19 (°mata);¹⁹ GKṬ 103.9 [*pratīka*]; see also *saugata*.
- bhagavān* TS 91.12 [=Kaṇāda];²⁰ see also *Kaṇāda*, *sūtrakāra* and *vaiśeṣika-sūtrapraṇetr*.
- bhaṭṭa* TS 4.13 (°mata), 20.4 (°naya), 24.10, 25.20 (°mata), 198.17,²¹ 242.8 (°mata), 248.18 (°mata); V 24.18 (pl.) [≈ TS 228.11 (*bhāṭṭa*!)]].
- Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra** MVV 2.11, 99.21, 149.22; TS 119.15 [colophon], 158.21 [colophon], 190.15 [colophon]; see also *Śaṅkarakiṅkara* and *Harakiṅkara*.
- bhavat* DKṬ 700.9 (°abhimata), 702.1, 705.24 (pl.); GKṬ 46.19 (pl.), 76.12 (pl.), 82.3 (pl.); TS 5.10 (pl.), 135.31 (pl.), 135.32 (°abhimata), 136.13 (pl.), 139.20 (°mata), 142.19 (°mata), 142.26 (°mata), 153.12 (pl.), 151.30 (°mata), 172.19 (°mata), 200.30 (pl.), 201.1 (°mata), 217.27 (pl.), 230.23; see also *bhavadiya*.
- bhavadiya* TS 143.8 (°anumāna); see also *bhavat*.

18 Read *prāñcaḥ* for *prāñca*.

19 Note that the *bauddhaḥ sambandhaḥ* of DKṬ 686.3 (a *pratīka* from the *Kiraṇāvalī*), though included under the item *Bauddha* in Thakur's list, has nothing to do with Buddhists but simply means 'a cognitive/mental connection,' as is clear from the context.

20 Note that other places, where *bhagavān* is added before a name as an honorific and where it refers to God have not been indexed.

21 In this case the name has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

bhāṭṭa DKṬ 673.20 (pl.); TS 168.28, 168.30 (*ādi), 168.32 (pl.), 169.6 (pl.), 169.26, 170.28 (*ādi), 171.2 (*ādi), 171.4 (*ādi), 171.5, 171.7, 171.8, 171.12, 171.13 (*mata), 228.11 (pl.) [≈ V 24.18 (bhāṭṭa!)], 248.24, 249.31, 251.19 (pl.). See also Bhāṭṭa.

bhāṣya DKṬ 617.16 (*nibandhana), 617.16 (*vyākhyāna), 617.21 (*artha), 617.22 (*artha), 619.22, 622.22, 623.25 (*virodha), 641.15, 648.13, 649.10 (*tātparyā), 649.11, 655.23 (*ārūḍhatā), 681.23, 686.7, 688.27, 689.7, 690.7, 691.27, 692.6; GKṬ 12.16 [2x], 18.15, 21.18, 22.9, 25.22, 25.23, 28.8 [2x],²² 33.21, 34.23 (*tātparyam), 44.8, 47.20, 48.1 (ukta°), 63.22, 63.24 (pūrva°), 64.6, 71.2, 71.11, 79.17 (uttara°), 81.11, 82.21 (*vyākhyāna), 82.23, 83.3, 87.21, 94.11, 94.18, 94.20, 96.24, 97.4, 103.10, 103.11;

bhāṣyakāra DKṬ 623.17, 629.5, 670.1, 690.14; GKṬ 58.19, 87.19; TS 85.17 (*ādi), 215.12, 215.17 (pl.), 218.16 (pl.) [≈ V 21.3]; V 20.2 (*ādi), 21.3 (pl.) [≈ TS 218.16]; see also Praśasta, Praśastapāda, praśastapāda-bhāṣyakāra and bhāṣyakṛt.

bhāṣyakṛt TS 71.11; see also Praśasta, Praśastapāda, praśastapādabhāṣyakāra and bhāṣyakāra.

Bhāsarvajña See Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra, bhūṣaṇa and bhūṣaṇakāra.

bhūṣaṇa GKṬ 4.4 [pratīka], 7.13; TS 115.22, 145.1 (*ādi), 145.7 (*ādi);

see also Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra and bhūṣaṇakāra.

bhūṣaṇakāra DKṬ 647.13; TS 207.14, 244.6 (*ādi); see also Nyāyabhūṣaṇa, nyāyabhūṣaṇakāra and Bhūṣaṇa.

Maṇḍana TS 26.26 (*ādi).

Manu DKṬ 656.27 (*ādi), 657.1 (*ādi), 657.15 (*ādi); TS 220.9 (*ādi) [≈ V 21.20], 220.14 (*ādi) [≈ V 22.2], 220.17 (*ādi); V 21.20 (*ādi) [≈ TS 220.9], 22.2 (*ādi) [≈ TS 220.14], 22.4 (*ādi), 22.5 (*ādi).

mahāvīdyāprayokṛ MVV 149.7 (pl.); see also mahāvīdyāvādin and sādhanavādin.

mahāvīdyāvādin MVV 74.6–7, 113.21, 135.27; see also mahāvīdyāprayokṛ and sādhanavādin.

Mahāvīdyāvidambana DKṬ 149.22. TS 101.16.

mādhyaṃika GKṬ 97.5, 97.16, 97.21.

māyāvādin GKṬ 97.5, 98.2; see also Māyāvedānta, māyāvedāntin, Vedānta and vedāntin.

Māyāvedānta TS 67.14 (*siddhānta); see also māyāvādin, māyāvedāntin, Vedānta and vedāntin.

māyāvedāntin V 70.17 [=p. 71.20 above]; see also māyāvādin, Vedānta and vedāntin.

mīmāṃsaka TS 27.12 (pl.), 38.5 (*mata), 48.29 (pl.), 48.30 (pl.), 48.31 (pl.), 48.32, 167.18 (pl.), 171.32, 172.2 (pl.), 172.4, 228.3 [≈ V 24.17].

22 tad anupapannam, vyākhyānaparagranthasandarbhasya etadbhāṣyānekabhāṣyavyākhyānōnarakālabhāvīprakriyāvṃyutpādanamādhye 'nyāntam asaṅgataivāi GKṬ 28.7–9.

- 228.8, 252.3 [≈ V 32.13],²³ 252.7 (pl.), 252.9; V 24.17 [≈ TS 228.3], 32.13 [≈ TS 252.3], 70.22 [=p. 72.4–5 above]; see also *guru*, Jaimini, Prabhākara, Prābhākara, Bhaṭṭa, Bhāṭṭa, Mīmāṃsā and Mīmāṃsābhāṣya.
- Mīmāṃsā** TS 15.30 [quote]; see also *guru*, Jaimini, Prabhākara, Prābhākara, Bhaṭṭa, Bhāṭṭa, *mīmāṃsaka* and *Mīmāṃsābhāṣya*.
- Mīmāṃsābhāṣya** TS 1.27 (°ādi).
- Yajurveda** TS 242.6 (°śruti).
- Yājñavalkya** DKT 703.26 (°ādi); TS 15.29.
- yogaśāstra** DKT 617.20 (°ādijñāna).
- Yogācāra** DKT 624.23, 625.16; GKT 97.5, 97.18, 97.22.
- Yogīśvara** MVV 149.21 (°guru).
- Īlāvātīkāra** TS 205.12 (°ādi); see also Vallabhācārya.
- Vallabhācārya** GKT 55.5–6 (pl.), 92.11; see also *Īlāvātīkāra*.
- Vāgbhaṭa** TS 155.23 (°ādi).
- Vācaspati** TS 16.18 (°ādi), 26.26 (°ādi).
- Vādivāgīśvara** TS 184.25, 221.26; V 36.22 (°ādi).
- Vādīndra** See Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, Śāṅkara-kīṅkara and Harakīṅkara.
- Vidyādharamiśra** TS 95.29, 111.6 (°ādi).
- Viṣṇumiśra** TS 165.1 (pl.).
- vr̥ttikāra** TS 129.14 (°ādi) [cf. V 11.10].
- veda** DKT 619.24 (°vākya), 619.27 (°vākya), 619.28 (°vākya); TS 1.19 (°ādi), 1.25 (°aprāmānya),²⁴ 2.1 (°prāmāṇaka), 2.14 (sāṅga°) [≈ V 1.16], 2.15 [≈ V 1.17], 2.19 (°sahasra), 3.30, 3.31, 4.4, 6.20, 6.23, 7.1, 7.6, 7.15, 7.28, 7.29, 8.3 [≈ V 2.1], 8.25 (°artha) [≈ V 2.9 (°ādi!)], 8.31, 13.6, 13.9, 13.10, 13.22, 15.31 (pl.) [quote], 16.1, 19.11, 22.16, 22.17, 31.21, 31.24, 31.25, 32.27 (°prāmānya), 32.32 (°prāmānya), 40.9, 40.10 (°vākya), 40.13 (°prāmānya), 40.14, 40.15 (°vākya), 40.16 (°vākya), 40.18 (°vākya), 41.28 (°nirmāṇe), 41.29 (°ādinirmāṇe), 42.4 (°vākya), 42.5 (°vākya), 42.21 (°vākya), 42.23 (°vākya), 42.25 (°vākya) [2x],²⁵ 42.29 (°vākya), 42.32 (°vākya), 43.14 (°vākya) [2x], 44.2 (°vākya) [2x], 44.3 (°vākya), 44.9 (°vākya), 44.10 (°vākya), 44.11 (°vākya), 44.13 (°vākya), 44.15 (°vākya), 44.16 (°vākya), 44.17 (°vākya), 44.19 (°vākya), 44.20 (°vākya), 44.23 (°vākya), 44.24 (°vākya), 44.25 (°vākya), 44.26 (°vākya), 44.30 (°vākya), 45.4 (°vākya), 45.5, 45.17 (°vākya), 47.1 (°vākya), 47.18 (°ādi), 47.29 (°vākya), 47.30 (°vākya), 48.4 (°vākya), 48.5 (°vākya), 48.10 (°vākya), 48.13 (°vākya), 48.19 (°vākya) [2x], 48.20 (°vākya) [2x], 48.21 (°pranetr̥), 48.22 (°vākya), 48.24 (°vākya), 48.27 (°vākya), 48.28 (°vākya), 48.29 (°kartr̥), 48.30 (°pranetr̥), 48.34 (°vākya), 49.2 (°vākya), 49.4 (°vākya), 49.9 [2x],

23 Here the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

24 Here the word has been restored by Thakur.

25 In the first case the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

- 49.10 (*vyākhyāna), 49.14 (*vyākhyāna), 49.19 *adhīta*° *śiṣya), 49.19 (**artha*), 49.19 (*vyākhyāna), 49.20 (**artha*), 49.21, 49.22, 49.25, 49.26, 49.27, 49.28, 56.3 (*adhīta*°), 56.3 (**prāmānya*), 56.10 (**prāmānya*), 56.13 (**prāmānya*) [2x], 56.14 (**prāmānya*), 56.19 (**prāmānya*), 56.23 (**prāmānya*) [2x], 56.29, 58.9 (**ādī*), 58.30 (**ādī*), 59.14 (*vyākhyāna), 59.22, 59.26, 59.27, 59.28, 242.20, 252.20, 252.24; V 1.16 (*sāṅga*°) [≈ TS 2.14], 1.17 [≈ TS 2.15], 2.1 [≈ TS 8.3], 2.9 (**ādī*) [≈ TS 8.25 (**artha*!)], 58.3 [= p. 57.3 above], 58.7 (**vākya-krama*) [= p. 57.6 above], 61.3; see also *R̥gveda*, *Yajurveda* and *vaidika*.
- vedāṅga* See *aṅga*.
- Vedānta** DKṬ 618.20 (**ādī*); TS 63.12 (**prāmānya*); see also *māyāvādin*, *Māyāvedānta*, *māyāvedāntin* and *vedāntin*.
- vedāntin* DKṬ 625.17 (pl.), 625.18 (pl.) [*prātika*]; see also *māyāvādin*, *Māyāvedānta*, *māyāvedāntin* and *Vedānta*.
- vaidika* TS 49.11 [quote], 49.12 (**pada*), 56.4 (**padārtha*), 59.14, (**padārtha*), 59.23 (**padārtha*).
- vaiyākaraṇa* DKṬ 685.15 (**mata*), TS 92.10 (pl.); see also Pāṇini.
- Vaiśeṣika** MVV 98.14 (**ādī*); DKṬ 618.17 (**śāstra*), 618.14–15 (**śāstra*), 618.17 (**śāstra*), 636.2, 661.16, 668.4, 678.20, 678.23, 679.11, 693.3 (pl.), 696.10–11 (pl.); GKṬ 2.23 (**upadeśa*), 7.20–21 (**ādī*), 7.25, 29.17–18 (pl.); TS 2.11 (**śāstra-prāmānya*), 2.12 (**śāstra*), 8.1 (**śāstravyutpādītānumāna*) [≈ V 1.25] 8.12 (**śāstra*), 23.31 (**mata*), 49.18 (**śāstra*), 145.2 (pl.), 172.3 (**mata*), 177.6 (**ādī*), 184.17 (**ādimata*), 237.1 (**ādī*), 242.8 (**ādimata*), 244.8 (pl.); V 1.25 (**śāstrapratipāditānumāna*) [≈ TS 8.1], see also *Nyāyavaiśeṣika*.
- vaiśeṣikaṃmānya* DKṬ 691.12 (pl.).
- Vaiśeṣikasūtra** TS 2.10.
- vaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetṛ* TS 8.21; see also *ācārya*, *Kaṇāda* and *sūtrakāra*.
- Vaiśeṣikasūtravārttika** TS 57.20–21 [colophon], 119.16 [colophon], 190.16 [colophon]; see also *Tarkasāgara* and *Kaṇādasūtravārttika*.
- Vyomaśiva** GKṬ 11.2, TS 215.29 (**ādī*).
- Śaṅkarakiṅkara** MVV 2.11; DKṬ 677.23; TS 1.7; see also Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and *Harakiṅkara*.
- Śakatāyana** TS 141.1 (**ādī*).²⁶
- Śālikanātha** GKṬ 100.22;²⁷ see also Śālikamiśra
- Śālikamiśra** TS 177.2 (**ādī*); see also Śālikanātha.
- śāstra** DKṬ 619.2, 619.22 (**ārambha*) [*prātika*], 677.17; TS 13.12 (**pratipādyā*), 13.15 (**abhidheya*), 13.16, 13.18 (**śravaṇa*), 13.19, 13.24 (**tātparya*), 13.24, 13.25 (**gocara*), 13.25 (**tātparya*), 13.26 (**tātparya*), 13.29 (**śravaṇa*), 13.29 (**ādī*), 13.31, 14.1 (**abhidheya*), 14.1 (**pratipādyā*), 14.2 (**pratipādyā*).

26 The name has been partly restored by Thakur.

27 Emending the printed Śālikanāthana to Śālikanāthana.

- 14.4 (*°prajojana*), 14.5 (*°prajojana*) [2x], 14.8 (*°abhidheya*), 14.9 (*°pratipādyatva*) [2x], 14.10 (*°pratipādyatva*), 14.20 (*°pratipādyatva*), 14.21 (*°pratipādyatva*) [2], 14.21 (*°apratipādyatva*), 14.22 (*viśeṣaṇībhūta°*), 14.22 (*°pratipādyatva*), 14.31, 14.32 (*°tātparya*), 14.33, 15.1, 15.2, 15.3 (*°samasta° °pratipādaka*), 15.4 (*°vaiyarthya*), 15.4 (*°śeṣa° °artha*), 15.6, 15.7, 15.8 (*°ādi*), 15.9, 15.10 (*°pratipādyatva*), 15.13 (*°pratipādyatva*), 15.14 (*etar° °janya*), 15.14 (*etar° °pratipādyatva*), 15.15 (*etar° °janya*) [2x], 15.17 (*°pratipādyatva*); see also Vaiśeṣika.
- śāstrakāra* MVV 90.17 (pl.);
- śāstrāntara* TS 8.11, 8.12 (pl.), 8.13.
- Śivādityamiśra MVV 74.27 (pl.), 99.14 (*°ādi*), 109.10 (pl.), 117.26 (pl.); TS 54.14, 101.12.
- Śrīkara TS 100.20.
- Śrīdharācārya DKṬ 622.14, 622.16, 695.23; GKṬ 81.13 (*°ādi*); TS 215.29–30 (*°ādi*).
- Śrīvallabhācārya See Vallabhācārya and *līlāvāṭikāra*.
- Śrīsimha MVV 99.21.
- śruti TS 7.31 [quote], 13.2 (*°ādi*), 134.32 [quote].
- ṣaṭṣūtrī TS 188.24 [≈ V 16.14]; V 16.14 [≈ TS 188.24].
- Sanaka TS 220.18 (*°ādi*), 220.24 (*°ādi*), 220.25 (*°ādi*).
- saptamādhyāya* V 64.7 [=p. 64.8 above], 64.7–8 [=p. 64.8 above], 64.11 [=p. 64.13–14 above].
- sampradāyavid* DKṬ 627.17 (pl.), 655.3–4 (pl.), 680.1 (pl.).
- Sāmkhya DKṬ 624.20 (pl.), 624.21 (pl.) [*pratīka*], 624.22 (pl.); GKṬ 7.23 (pl.), 32.20; TS 83.19 (pl.) [≈ V 4.23]; V 4.23 (pl.) [≈ TS 83.19].
- sādhanaśāstrin* MVV 136.7–8 [=mahāvidyāśāstrin according to Bhuvana-sundarasūri]; see also *mahāvidyāśāstrin* and *mahāvidyāśāstrin*.
- sāmpadāyika* TS 2.8 (*°ācāra*), 2.9 (pl.).²⁸
- siddhāntin* DKṬ 700.26 (=Udayana).
- sūtra* DKṬ 619.21, 629.11, 686.10, 703.19; GKṬ 20.1, 20.2, 66.16, 103.4;²⁹ TS 1.8, 7.20 (*°sākṣika*), 8.28 (pl.), 8.29 (pl.), 8.29 (*prathama°*), 8.31, 12.26 (*°tvayākopa*), 12.29 [quote], 12.32, 13.12 (*prathama°*), 13.12 (*dvitīya°*), 13.13 (*trītiya°*), 13.15 (*trītiya°*), 13.16 (*dvitīya°*), 13.22 (*trītiya°*), 13.24, 13.25 (*prathama°*), 13.32, 13.33 (*°antara*), 14.1 (*prathama°*), 14.3, 14.3 (*°antara*), 14.5 (*°antara*), 14.8, 14.10 (*guṇavibhāga°*), 14.11 (*°antara*), 14.18 (*prathama°*), 14.21 (*viśeṣaṇībhūta°*), 14.23 (*°antara*), 14.24 (pl.), 14.26, 14.27 (pl.), 14.27 (*prathama°*), 14.27 (*°antara*), 14.28 (*°antara*), 14.33 (*prathama°*), 15.1 (*prathama°*) [2x] 15.3, 15.7 (*etar° °vyākhyāna*), 15.7, 15.8 (*°vaiyarthya*), 15.12, 15.18, 15.19, 15.21, 15.24 (*dvaya*), 15.24 [2x], 32.32 (*trītiya°*), 38.33, 39.3, 39.7.

28 In the last place the word has been conjecturally restored by Thakur.

29 Note that in all the occurrences in GKṬ it is a sūtra of the Aṣṭādhyāyī that is meant.

39.9 (*prathama*°), 49.22 (*dvitīyatrīṭya*°), 49.24 [quote], 49.26 (*°dva-*
ya), 55.32, 55.33, 56.2 (*°artha*), 56.7,
 56.19, 56.28, 56.33, 57.9, 57.11,
 58.2, 58.3 (*°artha*), 59.14 (*°artha*),
 59.26 (*°artha*), 59.29 (*°artha*), 59.31
 (*°vyākhyānāntara*), 59.32, 60.6 [≈
 V 2.24], 66.18, 67.23, 68.17, 71.1
 (*°virodha*), 71.4, 83.34, 84.2, 84.4
 (*prathama*° *°artha*), 84.7 (*°dva-*
yatātparya), 84.9, 84.10 (*°artha*),
 84.13 (*°artha*), 84.13 (*pūrva*°), 84.17
 (*°artha*), 84.20, 84.29 (*°vyākhyā-*
na), 85.2 (*°arthāparijñāna*), 85.8
 (*°dvaya*), 85.10, 85.13 (*°artha*), 86.9,
 88.14, 88.17 (*°artha*), 88.20, 88.24,
 88.26, 89.5, 89.10, 89.13, 89.15
 [2x],³⁰ 89.18, 89.24 (pl.), 89.27,
 89.27 (*uttara*°), 91.30 (*dravyala-*
kṣaṇa°), 101.17 (pl.), 106.18 (*°ā-*
rambha), 108.6 (*°artha*), 108.28,
 109.20 (*°artha*), 109.28 (*°artha*),
 110.23 [≈ V 8.26], 113.29 (*°artha*)
 [≈ V 9.6], 119.10 (*°anārūdha-*
tva), 120.19 (*°artha*), 121.2, 121.4
 (*uttara*°), 121.15 (*°artha*), 122.8
 (*°artha*) [≈ V 9.22], 122.9, 122.13,
 122.19 (*pūrva*°), 122.20 (*pūrva*°),
 122.21 (pl.), 122.26, 123.25, 123.32
 (*°artha*), 124.7, 124.32 (*etar*°
°prayojana), 124.32 (*etar*° *°ā-*
rambha), 125.1, 125.3 (*pūrva*°),
 125.16, 125.24 (*°artha*), 125.25,
 125.29 (*pūrva*°), 141.13 (*°anā-*
rambhāprasaṅga), 149.6, 149.18,
 149.21 (*karmalakṣaṇa*°), 149.21,
 149.22 (*°bhāṅga*), 150.1, 150.29,
 152.3, 157.21 (*°artha*), 157.22,
 158.1, 158.14, 158.19 [2x], 158.23
 (*°artha*) [2x], 158.25 (*°vyāghā-*
ta), 159.6 (*°dvaya*), 159.28, 160.4
 (*°dvaya*), 161.7 (*°dvaya*), 162.6,

162.23 (*°artha*), 162.25, 162.26
 (*°artha*), 174.15, 174.30, 174.32,
 175.1 (*°avatāra*), 175.4, 175.19 [≈ V
 15.4], 176.4, 176.4, 186.23, 186.27,
 186.27 (*pratijñā*°), 187.14, 187.15,
 187.19 (*°artha*), 188.13 (*°artha*),
 188.18 (*°artha*), 188.19, 188.20
 (*°artha*), 189.3 (*°bheda**pranaya-*
na), 189.4 (*°pranayanaprasaṅga*),
 189.5 (*sarva*° *°pranayana*), 189.20
 (*°artha*), 191.23, 208.12, 209.27,
 215.29, 216.6, 217.27, 217.30
 (*°artha*), 218.3, 218.10 (*°artha*),
 219.4 (*°dvaya*) [≈ V 21.4], 220.10
 [≈ V 21.21], 222.24 (du.), 224.1,
 224.23, 225.4 (*°dvaya*) [≈ V 23.16],
 225.17, 226.14, 231.5 (*°dvaya*),
 232.4, 232.25 (*°sāmdarbhāitāp-*
rya), 235.14, 242.32 (*°dvaya*), 248.3
 (*upalabdhyānupalabdhi*°), 249.11
 (*°artha*) [≈ V 31.1], 249.13 [≈ V
 31.3], 253.3 (*siddhānta*°) [≈ V 33.4];
 V 2.22, 2.24 [≈ TS 60.6], 8.26 [≈ TS
 110.23], 9.6 (*°artha*) [≈ TS 113.29],
 9.8, 9.22 (*°artha*) [≈ TS 122.8],
 14.10, 15.4 [≈ TS 175.19], 21.4
 (*°dvaya*) [≈ TS 219.4], 21.9 (*°dva-*
yārtha), 21.10 (*siddhānta*°), 21.21
 [≈ TS 220.10], 23.16 (*°dvaya*) [≈
 TS 225.4], 25.2, 31.3 (*°artha*) [≈
 TS 249.11], 31.5 [≈ TS 249.13],
 33.4 [≈ TS 253.3] (*siddhānta*°),
 35.2, 37.24, 42.1, 43.3, 43.8, 46.6,
 51.1 (*°traya*), 53.2, 56.22, 63.12
 [=p. 63.2 above], 64.4 [=p. 64.4
 above], 64.5 [=p. 64.5 above], 64.6
 (pl.)³¹ [=p. 64.7 above], 65.16
 [=p. 66.6 above], 65.17 [=p. 66.7
 above], 66.21 (*°dvaya*) [=p. 67.18
 above], 68.9 (*°artha*) [=p. 69.17–
 18 above], 70.15 (pl.) [=p. 71.18
 above].

30 *anekasūtravyavahitayor dvitīyāhnikasūtrayoh.*

31 Singular in Thakur's edition, but see footnote 7 on p. 101 above.

sūtrakāra MVV 98.14–15; DKṬ 623.10, 648.5, 648.9, 648.10; TS 8.17, 53.9, 56.23, 60.1 [≈ V 2.22 (*sūtrakṛt*)], 60.3 [≈ V 2.23 (*sūtrakṛt*)], 60.5, 60.15 (°*vibhāgavākya*), 60.15 (°*vibhāgavacana*), 60.19 (°*vacana*), 62.32, 63.4 (°*vacana*), 63.16 (°*vacana*), 63.17 (°*ādī*), 63.18 (°*vacana*), 66.26, 66.28, 70.30, 82.11, 84.3, 92.32, 94.27 [2x], 94.29 [2x], 113.27, 144.18, 174.29, 175.3, 175.14, 186.14 (pl.), 207.24, 215.8, 223.27, 233.4–5 (°*vacana*), 233.8, 242.23, 242.24 (°*guru* = Mahādeva), 242.24 (°*ādī* = Mahādeva); see also *ācārya*, Kaṇāda and *vaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetṛ*.

sūtrakāraśiṣya TS 82.11 (pl.).

sūtrakṛt TS 214.31–32 [≈ V 20.6]; V 2.22 [≈ TS 60.1 (*sūtrakāra*)], 2.23 [≈ TS 60.3 (*sūtrakāra*)], 20.6 [≈ TS 214.31–32]; see also *ācārya*, Kaṇāda, *vaiśeṣikasūtrapraṇetṛ* and

sūtrakāra.

sūtravit TS 12.29 (pl.) [quote].

sūtravyākhyātṛ DKṬ 686.10 (*vacana*).

saugata GKṬ 41.1 (pl.); TS 152.15 (pl.) [≈ V 12.5], 152.28 (pl.), 157.8 (pl.), 160.4 (pl.), 164.4, 164.12 (pl.); V 12.5 (pl.) [≈ TS 152.15], 36.22 (°*ādī*); see also *bauddha*.

Sautrāntika TS 23.6 (°*mata*), 23.15 (pl.).

sthiravādin DKṬ 701.21; TS 153.33 (pl.).

smṛti TS 7.31 [quote], 13.2 (°*ādī*), 18.19 (*virodha*), 134.32 [quote].

Harakiṅkara TS 119.15 [colophon], 158.26 [colophon], 190.15 [colophon]; see also Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra and Śaṅkarakiṅkara.

Haraprasādanāma Kiraṇāvalīdarpaṇaka TS 135.14.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources, listed in section 1, are arranged by title according to the customary order of the Sanskrit alphabet. Secondary sources, in part 2, are ordered according to the last name of the author and using the order of the Roman alphabet.

Abbreviations of journal- and series-titles

AS	Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques.
GOS	Gaekwad's Oriental Series.
IJ	Indo-Iranian Journal.
JIBSt	Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies (<i>Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū</i>).
JOI	Journal of the Oriental Institute, M.S. University of Baroda.
VJ	Vishveshvaranand Indological Journal.
WZKS(O)	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- (und Ost-) Asiens.

SECTION I: PRIMARY SOURCES¹*Aṣṭaprakaraṇa*

- AP *Aṣṭaprakaraṇam*. Ed. Vrajavallabha Dvivedī. Varanasi 1988. *Yogatantra-grantha-mālā* 12.

¹ In the case of Indian editions with titlepages both in Sanskrit and in English, the information from the English titlepage alone is reproduced.

Aṣṭādhyāyī

Pāṇini's Grammatik. Herausgegeben, übersetzt, erläutert und mit verschiedenen Indices versehen von Otto Böhtlingk. Hildesheim/New York 1977. [Reprint; first published Leipzig 1887.]

Kāvya prakāśa

- KP The Poetic Light. Kāvya prakāśa of Mammata. Vol. I [Ullāsa I–VI]. Text with Translation and Sampradāyaprakāśinī of Śrīvidyācakra-vartin. [Ed. and trsl.] R. C. Dwivedi. Delhi 1977. [Second revised edition]

Kiraṇāvalī

- KĀ Praśastapādabhāṣyam with the commentary Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya. Ed. Jitendra S. Jetly. Baroda 1971. GOS 154.

Guṇakiraṇāvalīṭkā

- GKT The Rasasāra of Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra. Ed. Gopinātha Kavirāja. Benares 1922. The Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Texts No. 5.

Candrānanda's commentary on the VS

- C Vaiśeṣikasūtra of Kaṇāda, with the commentary of Candrānanda. Crit. ed. Muni Sri Jambuvijayaji. Baroda 1961. GOS 136. [A reprint of this edition appeared in 1982, but if at all possible, references should be made to the first edition. The reprint appears at first sight to be photo-mechanical but in fact contains misprints which were not in the first edition. The *suddhipatram* of the first edition has also not been reproduced, although many of its corrections have not been incorporated.]

Kāśikā

Kāśikavṛtti of Jayāditya-Vāmana (Along with Commentaries Padamañjarī of Haradatta Miśra and Vivaraṇapāñcikā-Nyāsa of Jinendrabuddhi). Ed. Śrīnārāyaṇa Miśra. Varanasi 1985. [6 volumes.] Ratnabharati Series 5–10.

Tarkasāgara

- TS Bhaṭṭavāḍindraracita-vaiśeṣikavārtika-kṛṣṇabhūpālaracita-trisūtrīprakāśājñā-takartṛkavṛttibhir vilasitam maharṣikaṇāda-praṇītam Vaiśeṣika-darśanam. Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1985.

Dravyakiraṇāvalīṭkā

- DKT Kiraṇāvalī of Udayanācārya. Edited by Narendra Chandra Vedantatirtha. Calcutta 1956. Bibliotheca Indica 200, Fasciculus 4. [Bhaṭṭa Vāḍindra's commentary on the *dravya* section of the *Kiraṇāvalī* is edited as an Appendix, covering p. 618–706.]

Nyāyakandalī

- NK¹ The Praśastapāda Bhāṣhya with commentary Nyāyakandalī of Sridhara. Ed. Vindhyaesvari Prasad Dvivedin. Reprinted, Delhi 1984. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 13. [First published Benares 1895].
- NK² Nyāyakandalī, being a commentary on Praśastabādhāṣya, with three sub-commentaries. Edited by Late Dr. J. S. Jetly and Vasant G. Parikh. Vadodara 1991. GOS 174.

Nyāyakumudacandra

- NKC Nyāya-Kumuda-Candra of Śrīmat Prabhācandrācārya: A Commentary on Bhaṭṭakalaṅkadeva's Laghīyastraya. Ed. Mahendra Kumar Nyāyācārya. 2 volumes. Delhi 1991. [Reprint, with a new foreword by V.N. Jha. First edition Bombay 1941.]

Nyāyabhāṣya

- NBh¹ Nyāyadarśanam, with Vātsyāyana's Bhāṣya, Uddyotkara's [sic] Vārtika, Vācaspati Miśra's Tātparyatīkā & Viśvanātha's Vṛtti. Chapter I, Section I critically edited with notes [by] Taranatha Nyaya-Tarkatīrtha and Chapters I-ii—V by Amarendramohan Tarkatīrtha, with an introduction by Narendra Chandra Vedantatīrtha. Delhi 1985. [Second edition; first published Calcutta 1936–1944.]
- NBh² Nyāyadarśana of Gautama, with the Bhāṣya of Vātsyāyana, the Vārtika of Uddyotakara, the Tātparyatīkā of Vācaspati and the Pārisuddhi of Udayana (Volume I chapter I). Ed. Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1967. Mithila Institute Series, Ancient Text no. 20.

Nyāyabhūṣaṇa

- NBhū Śrīmadācāryabhāsarvajñāpranītasya Nyāyasārasya svopajñam vyākhyānam Nyāyabhūṣaṇam. Ed. Svāmī Yogīndrānanda. Vārāṇasī 1968. Śaḍdarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā 1.

Nyāyamañjarī

- NM¹ The Nyāyamañjarī of Jayanta Bhaṭṭa. Ed. Sūrya Nārāyaṇa Śukla. 2 volumes. Benares 1934–1936. Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 106.
- NM² Nyāyamañjarī of Jayantabhāṭṭa, with Tīppaṇī—Nyāyasaurabha by the editor. Crit. ed. K. S. Varadacharya. Vol. I. Mysore 1969. Oriental Research Institute Series No. 116.

Nyāyaratnamālā

- Nyāyaratnamālā of Pārthasārathimiśra, with the commentary of Rāmānujācārya entitled, the Nayakarātna. Critically edited with an introduction and Indices by K. S. Rāmaswami Śāstri Śiromaṇi. Baroda 1937. GOS 75.

Nyāyalīlāvati

The Nyāya Līlāvati Ry [sic] Vallabhāchārya. With the Commentaries of Vardhamānopādhyāya, Śaṅkara Miśra and Bhagīratha Thakkura. Edited with notes, Introduction, & Index etc., By (1) Pandit Harihara Śāstri Lecturer, Benares Hindu University, 1–5 Fas. (2) Nyāyopādhyāya Pandit Dhundhirāja Śāstri Principal, N. V. Vidyalaya Benares. 6–9 Fas. Benares [1927–]1934. The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series Nos. 355, 376, 379, 387, 400, 407, 409, 412 & 422.

Nyāyavārttika, Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṭīkā and Tātparyapariśuddhi

NV For edition used see under NBh².

Nyāyasāravacāra

Nyāyasāra-Vicāra of Bhaṭṭa Rāghava. Ed. Umā Ramaṇa Jha. Jammu 1976.

Nyāyasūtra

NS For editions used see under *Nyāyabhāṣya* above. See also under Ruben in Section II below.

Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha

PDhS References are to the edition NK¹ described above unless specified otherwise. For other editions see under KĀ, NK², Vyo¹, Vyo² and, in Section II, Bronkhorst and Ramseier.

Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa

A Trident of Wisdom. Translation of [Abhinavagupta's] Parātrīśikā-vivaraṇa by Jaideva Singh. Foreword by Paul Muller-Ortega. Albany, N.Y. 1989. SUNY Series in Tantric Studies. [Contains Sanskrit text with separate pagination.]

Prakaraṇapañcikā

PP Prakaraṇa Pañcikā of Śālikanātha Miśra with the Nyāya-Siddhi of Jaipuri Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Ed. with Introduction and Notes by A. Subrahmanya Sastri. Benares 1961. Banaras Hindu University Darśana Series No. 4.

Pramāṇamañjarī

Tārikacūḍāmaṇi-Sarvadevaviracitā Pramāṇamañjarī. Saṃpādakartā Paṇ. Paṭṭābhīrāma Śāstrī. Jayapura (Rājasthāna) 1953. Rājasthāna Purātana Granthamālā 4.

Mahāvidyāvidambana

MVV Mahāvidyā-vidambana of Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra, with the commentaries of Ānanda-pūrṇa and Bhuvanasundara Sūri, and the Daśa-Sloki of Kulārka Pandita with Vivaraṇa and Vivaraṇa Tīppana. Edited with Introduction and Appendices by Mangesh Ramakrishna Telang. Baroda 1920. GOS 12.

Mānameyodaya

Mānameyodaya of Nārāyaṇa (An Elementary Treatise on the Mīmāṃsā). Edited with an English Translation by C. Kunhan Raja and S.S. Suryanarayana Sastri. Madras 1975. [Second edition; first edition 1933]. The Adyar Library Series. Vol. 105.

Māmanohara

Śrīmadācāryavādivāgīśvarapranītaḥ Māmanoharaḥ. Ed. Svāmī Yogīndrānandaḥ. Varanasi 1973. Śaddarśanaprakāśanagranthamālā 2.

Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa

The Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa, or Āpadevī: A treatise on the Mīmāṃsā system by Āpadeva. Translated into English, with an Introduction, transliterated Sanskrit text and glossarial Index, by Franklin Edgerton. New Haven 1929.

Yuktidīpikā

Yuktidīpikā: An ancient Commentary on the Sāṃkhya-Kārikā of Īśvarakṛṣṇa. Ed. Ram Chandra Pandeya. Delhi etc. 1967.

Abridged version of the Tarkasāgara

- V Vaiśeṣikadarśana of Kaṇāda, with an anonymous commentary. Edited by Anantalal Thakur. Darbhanga 1957. [Reprinted as appendix one of Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*. The reprint adds new printing mistakes and does not incorporate the corrigenda appended to the original edition.]

Vaiśeṣikasūtra

- VS For editions used see under C, TS, V and VSU.

Vaiśeṣikasūtrapaskāra

- VSU The Vaiśeṣika Darśana, with the commentaries of Śankara Miśra and Jayanārāyaṇa Panchānana. Ed. Pandita Jayanārāyaṇa Tarka Panchānana. Calcutta 1861. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series 24.

Vyomavatī

- Vyo¹ Praśastapādabhāṣyam of Praśasta Devāchārya, with commentaries (up to Dravya), Sūkti – by Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, Setu – by Padmanābha Miśra, and Vyomavatī by Vyomaśivāchārya (to the end). Ed. Gopinath Kaviraj and Dhundhiraj Shastri. Reprinted, Benares 1983. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 61. [First published Benares 1930].
- Vyo² Vyomavatī of Vyomaśivācārya. Ed. Gaurinath Sastri. 2 volumes. Varanasi 1983–1984. M. M. Śivakumāraśāstri-Granthamālā vol. 6.
- MS Manuscript C-1575, Oriental Research Institute, University of Mysore.

Śābarabhāṣya

Śrīmajjaiminipraṇīta mīmāṃsādarśana. Ed. Kāśīnātha Vāsudevaśāstrī Abhyamkar and Gaṇeśaśāstrī Joṣī. [7 volumes.] Pune 1972–1981. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 97.

Ślokavārttika

Ślokavārttika of Śrī Kumārila Bhaṭṭa, with the commentary Nyāyaratnākara of Śrī Pārthasārathi Miśra. Ed. Svāmī Dvārikadāsa Śāstrī. Varanasi 1978. Prāchyabhāratī Series 10.

Saptapadārthī

Saptapadārthī of Śivādityamiśra, with Jinavardhanasūri's Vyākhyā. Ed. J. S. Jetly. Lalbhai Dalpatbhai Series 1

Sarvadarśanasamgraha

SDS Śrīmādhavacāryapraṇītaḥ Sarvadarśanasamgrahaḥ, Madhusūdanasarasvatīkṛtaḥ Prasthānabhedaś ca. Ānandāśramasaṃskṛtagranthāvaliḥ 51.

'Sena Court' commentary on the VS.

- S An edition of *adhyāya* 9 is included as the second appendix in Thakur's edition of the *Tarkasāgara*. The tenth *adhyāya* survives in a palm-leaf manuscript in Newari script in the Asiatic Society, Calcutta (No. G-4737). The *sūtrapāṭha* of this commentary for both the ninth and the tenth *adhyāya* is given in Thakur 1965.

SECTION II: SECONDARY LITERATURE

Adriaansen, R., Bakker, H. T. and Isaacson, H.

1994 Towards a Critical Edition of the *Skandapurāṇa*. in: III 37 (1994), 325–331.

Aklujkar, Ashok

1970 Candrānanda's date. in: JOI 19 (1969/1970), 340–341.

Altekar, A. S.

1982 The Yādavas of Seunadeśa. Part VII in: G. Yazdani (ed.): The Early History of the Deccan. Parts VII–XI. New Delhi. [First published in 1960.] p. 513–574.

Bhandarkar, Shridhar R.

1888 A Catalogue of the Collections of Manuscripts Deposited in the Deccan College, with an Index. Bombay.

- Bhattacharya, Dineshchandra
1958 History of Navya-Nyāya in Mithilā. Darbhanga. Mithilā Institute Series 3 Studies No. 2.
- Bhaskaran, T.
1984 Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, Trivandrum. Vol. III (Ya to Sa). Edited and published by T. Bhaskaran. Trivandrum.
- Birwé, Robert
1961 Der Gaṇapāṭha zu den Adhyāyas IV und V der Grammatik Pāṇinis. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion. Wiesbaden.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes
1993a The Vaiśeṣika Vākya and Bhāṣya. in: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 52–53 (1991–1992) [appeared in 1993], 145–169.
1993b Studies on Bhartṛhari, 5: Bhartṛhari and Vaiśeṣika. in: Asiatische Studien/Études Asiatiques 47.1 (1993), 76–94.
- Bronkhorst, Johannes and Ramseier, Yves
1994 Word Index to the Praśastapādabhāṣya: a complete word index to the printed editions of the Praśastapādabhāṣya. Delhi.
- Bühler, G.
1896 Indische Palaeographie, von circa 350 A. Chr.—circa 1300 P. Chr. Strassbourg. Grundriss der indi-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, I. Band, 11. Heft.
- Burnell, Arthur Coke
1878 Elements of south-Indian palaeography, from the fourth to the seventeenth century A.D. Second enlarged and improved edition. London.
- Chemparathy, George
1968 The Īśvara doctrine of Praśastapāda. in: VII 6 (1968), 65–87.
1969a Two little-known fragments from early Vaiśeṣika literature on the omniscience of Īśvara. in: The Adyar Library Bulletin 33 (1969), 117–134.
1969 The various names for the famous Vaiśeṣika work of Praśastapāda. in: Rtam vol. 1 no. 1 (1969), 23–27.
1970a Praśastapāda and his other names. in: Indo-Iranian Journal vol. 12 (1969/1970), 241–254.
1970b The Īśvara doctrine of the Vaiśeṣika commentator Candrānanda. in: Rtam vol. 1 no. 2 (1970), 47–52.
1972 An Indian Rational Theology. Introduction to Udayana's Nyāya-kusumāñjali. Vienna. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Vol. I.

Clooney, Francis X.

- 1990 Thinking Ritually: Rediscovering the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā of Jaimini. Vienna. Publications of the De Nobili Research Library vol. 17.

Dearing, Vinton A.

- 1979 Response to M. P. Weitzman [cf. Weitzman 1977]. in: Vetus Testamentum 29 (1977), 355–359.
1983 A Manual of Textual Analysis. Westport, Connecticut. [First published Berkeley 1959].

Edgerton, Franklin

- 1929 See *Mīmāṃsānyāyaprakāśa* in Section I.

EDHSP

- 1976– An Encyclopedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles. General editor A. M. Ghatage (from vol. 3 part 3 S. D. Joshi). Poona.

Faddegon, B.

- 1918 The Vaiṣeṣika-system, described with the help of the oldest texts. Amsterdam. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks. Deel XVIII no. 2.

Flight, Colin

- 1992 Stemmatic theory and the analysis of complicated traditions. in: Manuscripta 36 (1992), 37–52.

Franco, Eli

- 1994 Perception, Knowledge and Disbelief: A Study of Jayarāṣi's Scepticism. Delhi. [Second edition; first edition Stuttgart 1987.]

Frauwallner, Erich

- 1955 Candramati und sein Daśapadārthaśāstram. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Vaiśeṣika. in: Studia Indologica, Festschrift für Willibald Kirfel (Bonner Orientalische Studien 3) Bonn 1955, 65–85
1956 Geschichte der Indischen Philosophie. Band 2. Salzburg.
1970 Die Lehre von der zusätzlichen Bestimmung (*upādhiḥ*) in Gaṅgeśa's Tattvacintāmaṇiḥ. Wien.
1984 Der ursprüngliche Anfang der Vaiśeṣika-Sūtren. in: E. Frauwallner: Nachgelassene Werke I. Aufträge, Beiträge, Skizzen. Herausgegeben von Ernst Steinkellner (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 19). Wien, 35–41.

- 1992 Nachgelassene Werke II. Philosophische Texte des Hinduismus. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Oberhammer und Chlodwig H. Werba. Wien. Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 588. Band = Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Nr. 26.
- Gerow, E.
1990 The Jewel-Necklace of Argument (The *Vādaratnāvalī* of Viṣṇu-dāsācārya). New Haven. American Oriental Society Translation Series vol. 2.
- Goekoop, Cornelis
1967 The Logic of Invariable Concomitance in the *Tattvacintāmaṇi*. Gaṅgeśa's *Anumitinirūpaṇa* and *Vyāptivāda* with Introduction, Translation and Commentary. Dordrecht. [Dissertation, University of Amsterdam]
- Gonda, Jan
1975 Vedic Literature (*Samhitās* and *Brāhmaṇas*). Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature vol. I, fasc. 1.
- Gough, Archibald Edward
1975 The *Vaiśeṣika* Aphorisms of Kanāda, with comments from the *Upaskāra* of Śāṅkara Misra and the *Vivṛiti* of Jaya-Nārāyaṇa Tarkapañchānaṇa. Delhi. [First published in 1873.]
- Greetham, D. C.
1992 Textual Scholarship: An Introduction. New York/London.
- Greg, W. W.
1927 The Calculus of Variants. An Essay on Textual Criticism. Oxford.
- Grünendahl, Reinhold
1993 Zur Klassifizierung von Mahābhārata-Handschriften. in: Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert. Herausgegeben von Reinhold Grünendahl, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Petra Kieffer-Pülz. Bonn 1993. p. 101–130.
- Halbfass, Wilhelm
1991 Tradition and Reflection. Explorations in Indian Thought. Albany.
1992 On Being and What There Is. Classical *Vaiśeṣika* and the History of Indian Ontology. Albany.
- Hall, Fitzedward
1859 A contribution towards an index to the bibliography of the Indian philosophical systems. Calcutta.

- Handiqui, Krishna Kanta
 1965 Naiṣadhacarita of Śrīharṣa. For the first time translated into English with critical Notes and Extracts from unpublished Commentaries, Appendices and a Vocabulary. Poona. [Third Edition.]
- Hara, Minoru
 1992 Pāsupata Studies (1). in: *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in honor of André Padoux*. Edited by Teun Goudriaan. Albany, N.Y, 1992. SUNY Series in Tantric Studies. p. 209–226.
- Hattori, Masaaki
 1968a Two types of non-qualificative perception. in: *Beiträge zur Geistesgeschichte Indiens: Festschrift für Erich Frauwallner*. WZKSO XII/XIII (1968/1969), 161–169.
 1972 Praśastapāda and Dignāga. A note on the development of the Vaiśeṣika theory of anumāna. in: WZKS XVI (1972), 169–180.
- Honda, Megumu
 1990 A reading in the Vaiśeṣika Sūtra. in: *Dōhō daigaku kiyō* 4 (1990), 172–79.
 1993 *pratyagātman* in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. in: WZKS 32 (1992), Supplement: Proceedings of the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vienna 1990. Wien 1993. p. 293–297.
- Houben, Jan E. M.
 1992 The Saṃbandha-Samuddeśa (Chapter on Relation) and Bhartṛhari's Philosophy of Language. Utrecht. [Dissertation; a revised version is to be published in 1995.]
 1995 Liberation and natural philosophy in early Vaiśeṣika: some methodological problems. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 711–748.
- Isaacson, Harunaga
 1990 A study of early Vaiśeṣika: the teachings on perception. Groningen 1990. [Unpublished M.A. thesis.]
 1994 Yogic perception (*yogipratyakṣa*) in early Vaiśeṣika. in: *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 18 (1993) [appeared in 1994], 139–160.
 1995 Notes on the manuscript transmission of the Vaiśeṣikasūtra and its earliest commentaries. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 749–779.
- Jhā, Gaṅganātha (trsl.)
 1983 Kumārila Bhaṭṭa: *Tantravārttika*. A Commentary on Śabara's Bhāṣya on the Pūrvamīmāṃsā Sūtras of Jaimini. 2 volumes. Delhi 1983. [First published Calcutta 1903–1924.]

Jhalakīkar, Bhīmācārya

- 1978 Nyāyakośa or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian Philosophy. Revised and re-edited by Vāsudev Shāstrī Abhyankar. Poona. [Forth edition.] Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series No. XLIX.

Kane, Pandurang Vaman

- 1973 History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. III. Poona 1973. (Second Edition).
 1974a History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. II, Part II. Poona 1974. (Second Edition).
 1974b History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval, Religious and Civic Law). Vol. V, Part I. Poona 1974. (Second Edition).

Kaviraj, Gopinath [Gopīnātha Kavirāja]

- 1929 Some variants in the readings of the Vaiśeṣika sūtras. in: Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Studies 7 (1929), 71–76.
 1961 Gleanings from the history and bibliography of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika literature. Calcutta. Indian Studies Past and Present. [First published in the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhavana Series. vols. III–V, 1924.]

Kiehnle, Catharina

- 1979 Vedisch ukṣ und ukṣ/vakṣ. Wortgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchungen. Wiesbaden 1979. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 21.

Marui, Hiroshi

- 1985 A Study on the Textual Problems of the Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha. in: Tōhō 1 (1985), 106–120.

Matilal, Bimal Krishna

- 1968 The Navya-nyāya Doctrine of Negation. The Semantics and Ontology of Negative Statements in Navya-nyāya Philosophy. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Oriental Series Vol. 46.
 1977 Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature vol. VI, fasc. 2.

Mishra, Umesh

- 1987 Conception of Matter according to the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Reprinted, New Delhi. [First published Allahabad. 1936.]

Motegi, Shūjun

- 1995 Some Vaiśeṣika thoughts referred to in the Yuktidīpikā. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiśeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 807–817.

Nenninger, Claudius

- 1992 Aus gutem Grund. Praśastapāda's anumāna-Lehre und die drei Bedingungen des logischen Grundes. Reinbek. Philosophia Indica: Einsichten, Ansichten Bd. 1.

Nozawa, Masanobu

- 1974 The sūtrapāṭha of the Vaiṣeṣikasūtra-vyākhyā. in: JIBSt vol. 23 no. 1 (1974), 474–471.
 1976 The Vaiṣeṣikasūtra referred to in the Padārthadharmaśaṃgraha. in: JIBSt vol. 24 no. 2 (1976), 1000–1006.
 1985 A Comparative Table of the Vaiṣeṣikasūtra. in: Numazu Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō Kenkyū Hōkoku 20 (1985), 75–93.
 1993a The Vaiṣeṣikasūtra with Candrānanda's Commentary (1). in: Numazu Kōgyō Kōtō Senmon Gakkō Kenkyū Hōkoku 27 (1992) [appeared in 1993], 97–116.
 1993b Theory of Perception in the 8th Adhyāya of the *Vaiṣeṣikasūtra*. IBK 41.2 (1993), 1156(7)–1150(13).

Oetke, Claus

- 1988 "Ich" und das Ich. Analytische Untersuchungen zur buddhistisch-brahmanischen Ātmankontroverse. Stuttgart. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 33.

Pandeya, A.N.

- 1953 Ātreya and his Bhāṣya on the Vaiṣeṣika Sūtras. in: Summaries of Papers (submitted to the 17th Session of the All-India Oriental Conference), ed. by the local secretary. Ahmedabad 1953, 258–260. [To the best of my knowledge the full paper was never published.]

Potter, Karl H. (ed.)

- 1977 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. II: Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa. Princeton 1977.
 1983 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. I: Bibliography. Delhi 1983.

Potter, Karl H. and Bhattacharyya, Sibajiban

- 1993 Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies vol. VI: Indian Philosophical Analysis: Nyāya-Vaiṣeṣika from Gaṅgeśa to Raghunātha Śiromaṇi. Delhi.

Preisendanz, Karin

- 1995 Vaiṣeṣikasūtra IV.1.9 and its two traditions of interpretation. in: AS 48.2 (1994) [appeared in 1995] [= Johannes Bronkhorst (ed.): Proceedings of the Panel on Early Vaiṣeṣika, Hong Kong, August 1993], 867–890.

- Raghavan, V.
1963 Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra Prakāśa. Madras.
- Ramanujam, P.S.
1979 A study of Vaiśeṣika philosophy with special reference to Vyomaśivācārya. Mysore.
- Renou, Louis and Filliozat, Jean
1953 L'Inde Classique. Manuel des Études Indiennes. Tome II. Paris/Hanoi.
- Robinson, Fred C.
1994 The Editing of Old English. Oxford.
- Salemans, Ben
1990 Text genealogical remarks on Lachmann, Bédier, Greg and Dearing. in: Leuvense Bijdragen 79 (1990), 427–468.
- Schmithausen, Lambert
1970 Zur Lehre von der vorstellungsfreien Wahrnehmung bei Praśastapāda. in: WZKS XIV (1970), 125–129.
- Shackleton Bailey, David R.
1976 Editing Ancient Texts. in: Herbert H. Paper (ed.), Language and Texts. The Nature of Linguistic Evidence. Ann Arbor 1976. p. 21–32.
- Shah, Umakant P.
1975 A reference to Bhaṭṭa Candrānanda by Abhinavagupta. in: Saṃbodhi vol. 4 no. 1 (1975), 7–8.
- Sharma, V. Venkatarama
1951 Vaiśeṣika-sūtras. in: JOI 1 (1951), 225–227.
- Shastri, Dharmendra Nath
1976 The philosophy of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika and its conflict with the Buddhist Dignāga school (Critique of Indian Realism). Reprinted. Delhi/ Varanasi. [First published Agra 1964.]
- Slaje, Walter
1983 Die Wahrnehmungslehre bei Vyomaśivah. Wien. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation.]
1993 Śārada. Deskriptiv-synchrone Schriftkunde zur Bearbeitung kaschmirischer Sanskrit-Manuskripte. Auf der Grundlage von Kuśāla's *Ghaṭakharpara-Gūḍhadīpikā* und unter graphischer Mitwirkung von Eva Slaje. Reinbek. Indische Schriften. Band 1.

Solomon, Esther A.

- 1976 Indian Dialectics: Methods of Philosophical Discussion. Volume I. Ahmedabad 1976. Sheth Bholabhai Jeshingbhai Institute of Learning and Research, Research Series, No. 70.

Speyer, J. S.

- 1886 Sanskrit Syntax. Leiden.

Srinivasan, Srinivasa Ayya

- 1967 Vācaspatiśra's Tattvakaumudī: Ein Beitrag zur Textkritik bei kontaminierter Überlieferung. Hamburg. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien 12.

Tachikawa, Musashi

- 1981 The Structure of the World in Udayana's Realism. A study of the *Lakṣaṇāvalī* and the *Kiraṇāvalī*. Dordrecht. Studies of Classical India vol. 4.

Tanaka, Norihiko

- 1987 A New Manuscript of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* Preserved in Kashmir University. in: *Jimbungaku-ronshū* (Journal of Humanistic Studies) 21 (1987), 1–45.
- 1991 The Tradition of the *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* in *śāradā* script. in: *Bukkyō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 75 (1991), 1–24.
- 1994 The *Padārthadharmasaṃgraha* of Praśastapāda. Volume I: *Dra-vyaprakaraṇa*. [Part I Variant Readings of the Manuscripts (1)]. Kyoto 1994.

Tanselle, G. Thomas

- 1990 Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing. Charlottesville/London. [Collection of papers published between 1971 and 1983.]
- 1994 Editing without a Copy-Text. in: *Studies in Bibliography* 47 (1994), 1–22.

Thakur, Anantalal

- 1947 Ātreya - the Bhāṣyakāra. in: *Indian Culture* vol. 13 no. 3 (1947), 185–188.
- 1949 Uddyotakara as a Vaiśeṣika. in: *Proceedings and Transactions of the All India Oriental Conference Fifteenth Session*. Bombay 1949, 327–334.
- 1960 Bhaṭṭavādīndra - the Vaiśeṣika. in: *JOI* 10 (1960), 22–31.
- 1963a Vātsyāyana and the Vaiśeṣika system. in: *VJ* 1 (1963), 78–86.
- 1963b Textual problems of the *Vaiśeṣikasūtras*. in: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 49 (1963), 186–188.
- 1965 Studies in a fragmentary *Vaiśeṣikasūtravṛtti*. in: *JOI* 14 (1965), 330–335.
- 1969 The problem of the *Vaiśeṣika-bhāṣya*. in: *Proceedings of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists, New Delhi January 4–10 1962 vol. III pt. I*. Poona 1969, 489–493.

- 1975 Vācaspatimiśra's Nyāyavārttikatātparyāṅkā and the Vaiśeṣika system. in: Sanskrit and Indological Studies. Dr. V. Raghavan Felicitation Volume. Ed. R.N. Dandekar et. al. Delhi 1975. 425–435.
- Telang, Mangesh Ramakrishna
1920 See *Mahāvidyāvidāmbana* in Section I.
- Tripathi, Chandrabhal
1975 Catalogue of the Jaina manuscripts of Strasbourg: Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg. Leiden. Indologia Bero-
linensis Bd. 4.
- Türistig, Hans-Georg
1982 Über Entstehungsprozesse in der Philosophie des NyāyaVaiśe-
ṣika-Systems. Wiesbaden. Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung Süd-
asien-Institut Universität Heidelberg Band 78.
- Ui, Hakuju
1962 The Vaiśeṣika philosophy, according to the Daśapadārtha-Śāstra.
Chinese text with introduction, translation and notes. Second edi-
tion, Varanasi. The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Studies vol. XXII.
[First edition London 1917. Royal Asiatic Society, Oriental
Translation Fund, N.S., vol. XXIV.]
- Upadhye, A.N. (ed.)
1971 Siddhasena Divākara's Nyāyāvatāra (ed. by the late S.C. Vidya-
bhusan with English Translation Notes etc.) and with the Vivṛti of
Siddharṣi as well as the text of 21 Dvātrīṃśikās and the Sammāi-
Suttam. Vinayavijaya's Nayakarmikā (ed. by the late M.D. Desai
with English Translation etc.). Bombay.
- Verpoorten, Jean-Marie
1987 Mīmāṃsā Literature. Wiesbaden. A History of Indian Literature
Vol. VI Fasc. 5.
- Weitzman, M. P.
1977 Review of V. A. Dearing *Principles and practice of textual analysis*
(Berkeley 1974) [cf. Dearing 1983]. in: *Vetus Testamentum* 27
(1977), 225–235.
- West, Martin
1973 Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique, applicable to Greek
and Latin texts. Stuttgart.
- Wezler, Albrecht
1982a Remarks on the definition of 'yoga' in the Vaiśeṣikasūtra. in: In-
dological and Buddhist studies. Volume in honour of Professor
J.W. de Jong on his sixtieth birthday. Ed. by L.A. Hercus et. al.
Canberra 1982. p. 643–686.

- 1982b Manu's Omniscience: On the Interpretation of *Manusmṛti* II, 7. in: *Indology and Law: Studies in Honour of Professor J. Duncan M. Derrett*. Ed. Günther-Dietz Sontheimer and Parameswara Kota Aithal. Wiesbaden 1982. *Beiträge zur Südasien-Forschung* 77. p. 79–105.
- 1983a A note on concept *adr̥ṣṭa* as used in the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra*. in: Aruṇabhārati. Professor A.N. Jani felicitation volume (Essays in contemporary indological research). Ed. by B. Datta et. al. Baroda 1983, 35–58.
- 1983b Philological Observations on the so-called *Pātañjalayogasūtra-bhāṣyavivarāṇa*. (Studies in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* I). in: *III* 25 (1983), 17–40.
- 1984 Further references to the *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa*. (Studies in the *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa* III.) in: *Amṛtadhara*. Prof. R.N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume. Ed. by S.D. Joshi. Delhi 1984, 457–472.
- 1985 Bemerkungen zu *Vaiśeṣika-Sūtra* 6.1.1–3 (Resümee). in: *XXII. Deutscher Orientalistentag*, vom 21. bis 25. März 1983 in Tübingen. *Ausgewählte Vorträge*. Ed. Wolfgang Röllig. Stuttgart 1985. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement VI. p. 282.
- Whitney, William Dwight
- 1885 *The Roots, Verb-forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Leipzig.

Nederlandse samenvatting (Dutch summary)

Dit proefschrift bevat een aantal afzonderlijke edities en studies van belangrijke teksten van het Vaiśeṣika, een stroming die met name in het eerste millennium een belangrijke rol speelde in de Indiase filosofie. Onderzocht werd of, en in hoeverre, een nieuwe studie van manuscript materiaal verbeteringen ten opzichte van eerdere edities mogelijk zou maken.

In deel één staat de commentaar van Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra op het *Vaiśeṣikasūtra* (VS) centraal. Een uitgebreide inleiding bespreekt ondermeer Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's datum, zijn werken en zijn belang als filosoof. Aangetoond wordt dat deze auteur op vele punten eigenzinnige theorieën had, die niet uit andere bronnen bekend zijn. Ook wordt ingegaan op de relatie tussen de twee recensies van Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's commentaar op het VS. De conclusie is dat de langere recensie Bhaṭṭa Vādīndra's oorspronkelijk werk is, en dat de kortere een verkorte versie vormt die gemaakt is door een andere, anonieme, persoon. Vervolgens wordt een her-editie geboden van twee delen van de korte recensie. Deze is—in tegenstelling tot de *editio princeps* van A. Thakur—rechtstreeks gebaseerd op (foto's van) het enig bekende handschrift. Mede hierdoor is het mogelijk gebleken op vele punten de tekst te verbeteren. Tevens wordt voor het eerst een vertaling gegeven van de geëditeerde delen, voorzien van aantekeningen die tekstuele en inhoudelijke problemen bespreken.

Deel twee biedt een soortgelijke studie van de commentaar van Candrānanda op het VS. Een aantal niet eerder gebruikte manuscripten van deze commentaar is aan het licht gekomen; de handschriften en hun relatie worden besproken. Vervolgens wordt een nieuwe editie gegeven van de opening van de commentaar; ook hier bleek verbetering mogelijk ten opzichte van de overigens uitstekende eerste editie van Jambūvijaya. Van het geëditeerde deel is al eerder een Engelse vertaling verschenen (Nozawa 1993a); mede hierom wordt in plaats van een vertaling een commentaar gegeven, waarin afwijkingen van de eerdere editie gerechtvaardigd, en tekstuele en inhoudelijke moeilijkheden besproken worden.

In deel drie worden twee handschriften besproken die de tekst van het VS bevatten zonder een commentaar. Beiden worden diplomatisch geëditeerd. Tevens wordt een hypothetische reconstructie gegeven van de tekst van de sūtras, waarbij gepoogd wordt overleveringsfouten voor zover mogelijk te corrigeren. Aangetoond wordt dat de tekst van beide handschriften in ieder geval niet afgeleid kan zijn van een van de andere bekende recensies van de VS (met een commentaar). Voorgesteld wordt dat beiden beschouwd moeten worden als vertegenwoordigers van recensies

die niet elders gedocumenteerd zijn, en dat beiden ooit geassocieerd zijn geweest met commentaar-tradities die niet overgeleverd of nog niet ontdekt zijn. Eerste aanzetten worden geboden voor evaluatie van deze twee 'nieuwe' recensies; er wordt betoogd dat voor onderzoek naar met name de vroege geschiedenis van het Vaiśeṣika het van groot belang is ook dit materiaal in beschouwing te nemen.

Het proefschrift wordt afgesloten met vier Appendices. Appendix 1 bestaat uit een concordantie van de verschillende recensies van het VS. In Appendix 2 wordt een concordantie gegeven van de handschriften van Candrānanda's commentaar op het VS. Appendix 3 bespreekt in detail de tekstkritische problemen rond een andere belangrijke Vaiśeṣika tekst, de *Padārthadharmasamgraha* van Praśastapāda. Appendix 4 bevat een index van verwijzingen naar personen en teksten die worden aangetroffen in de werken van Bhaṭṭa Vādiṇdra.

Curriculum vitae

Born in Kuma, Japan, August 23, 1965. Secondary education at Praedinius Gymnasium, Groningen, 1978—1984. Studied philosophy and indology at the University of Groningen from September 1985. *Doctoraal* (roughly equivalent to M.A.) degree awarded May 1990 (*cum laude*). Studied at the Seminar für Geschichte und Kultur Indiens und Tibets, Universität Hamburg, from October 1990 through February 1991. Attached to the University of Groningen as research assistant (OIO) sponsored by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) from March 1, 1991, to March 1, 1995. Michael Coulson Junior Research Fellow in Indology at Wolfson College, Oxford, from October through December 1994.